

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

W. KURRELMEYER

VOLUME XLIII

1928

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Kurrelmeyer, W., Neue Wieland-Doppeldrucke	1
Wesenberg, T. G., The Case of the Predicate Complement after Reflexive Verbs in Old French	11
Heltzel, V. B., <i>The Rules of Civility</i> (1671) and its French Source..	17
Maxwell, B., The Date of <i>The Noble Gentleman</i>	22
Withington, R., A Note on <i>Eastward Ho</i> , I, ii. 178	28
Whitford, R. C., Gleanings of Churchill Bibliography	30
Small, Miriam R., The Source of a Note in Johnson's Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34
McKillop, A. D., The First English Translator of <i>Werther</i>	36
Jordan, J. C., <i>The Eve of St. Agnes</i> and <i>The Lay of the Last Minstrel</i>	38
Schaffer, A., Boylesve Redivivus	41
Anderson, Jesse M., A Note on the Date of <i>Winnere and Wastoure</i> .	47
Zeydel, E. H., The Relations of Ludwig Tieck and K. G. Carus...	73
Bowyer, J. W., Susanna Freeman Centlivre.. . . .	78
Irving, W. H., An Imitation of the <i>Faerie Queene</i>	80
Reed, E. B., "Wynter Wakeneth Al My Care"	81
Holmes, U. T., The Saracen Oath in the <i>Chansons de Geste</i>	84
Wray, Edith, English Adaptations of French Drama between 1780 and 1815.....	87
Kurrelmeyer, W., Doppeldrucke von Wielands <i>Deutschem Merkur</i> .	91
Taylor, Pauline, Fredegundis and Audovera	94
Bennett, R. E., A Note on the Cyrano-Swift Criticism	96
Hillhouse, J. T., A or An.....	98
Bush, D., Musaeus in English Verse	101
Robertson, S., Chaucer and Wordsworth.	104
Todd, O. J., Who Wrote Shakespeare's Plays?	106
Greene, R. L., A Re-arrangement of <i>Christ and Satan</i>	108
Buck, H., A <i>Roderick Random</i> Play, 1748.....	111
Oliphant, E. H. C., A Note....	112
Aldington, R., Mr. Aldington Replies	114
Bernbaum, E., Professor Bernbaum Rebuts	115
Schwartz, W. L., A Study of Amy Lowell's Far Eastern Verse	145
Snyder, E. D., Poe and Amy Lowell	152
Kurrelmeyer, W., Doppeldrucke von Wielands <i>Auserlesenen Gedichten</i>	152
Michaud, G. L., The Spanish Sources of certain Sixteenth-Century French Writers.....	157
Green, O. H., Sources of Two Sonnets of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola	163
Andrews, A. L., Old Norse Notes	166
Zeydel, E. H., <i>Sturm und Drang</i> once more	171

	PAGE
Hillhouse, J. T., The Man of Taste.	174
Krappe, E. S., A Note on Chaucer's Yeoman.	176
Savage, H. L., A Note on <i>Parlement of the Thre Ages</i> 38.	177
Warren, F. M., Was Balzac's <i>Illusions Perdues</i> influenced by Stendhal?	179
Shanks, L. P., A Note on Baudelaire	181
Raysor, T. M., Coleridge Marginalia.	182
Loomis, R. S., Calogrenanz and Crestien's Originality	215
Lathrop, H. B., Janus Cornarius's <i>Selecta Epigrammata Graeca</i> and the Early English Epigrammatists	223
Chapman, C. O., <i>The Parsons Tale: a Mediaeval Sermon</i>	229
Robertson, S., Old English Verse in Chaucer.	234
Fess, G. M., <i>Les Employés</i> and <i>Scènes de la vie bureaucratique</i>	236
Sturtevant, A. M., A Note on the Gothic Particle <i>pau</i>	242
Kurrelmeyer, W., Zu den Doppeldrucken der Goethe-Ausgabe 1806	245
Roulston, R. B., Notes on the Elegiac Distich in German	247
Royster, J. F., E. K.'s <i>Elf < Guelph, Goblin < Ghibelline</i>	249
Dustoor, P. E., Notes on the E. E. T. S. Edition of the Newcastle <i>Noah's Ark</i>	252
Wright, L. B., A Note on Dramatic Piracy.	256
Wright, L. B., Heywood and the Popularizing of History	287
Williamson, G., Sir Thomas More's View of Drama.	294
Cawley, R. R., George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta.	296
Malone, K., Hunlafing.	300
Clubb, M. D., The Second Book of the 'Cædmonian' Manuscript.	304
Jackson, J. H., Oðinn's Meetings with Sigmundr and Sigurðr in the <i>Völungasaga</i>	307
Kurrelmeyer, W., Another Letter from Tieck to Carus.	308
Dale, G. I., A Second Source of Lope's <i>El Castigo del discreto</i>	310
Bond, R. P., A Triple Burlesque	312
Stearns, Helen, The Date of the <i>Garlande of Laurell</i>	314
Barret, P., Shakespeare's Paraphrase of his <i>Thought-executing Fires</i>	316
Terrill, T. E., A Note on John Donne's Early Reading.	318
Hughes, Helen S., Another Letter by Horace Walpole.	319
Case, A. E., The Model for Pope's Verses <i>To the Author of a Poem</i> <i>Intituled 'Successio'</i>	321
Zeitler, W. I., The Date of Spenser's Death.	322
Cooper, L., "A Note on <i>Eastward Ho</i> , I, ii, 178".	324
Mustard, W. P., "Agrippa's Shadows"	325
Bond, D. F., The <i>Essay on Man</i> , Epistle II, Lines 31-34.	326
Raymond, W. O., New Light on the Genesis of <i>The Ring and the Book</i>	357
Nethercot, A. H., The Letters of Abraham Cowley.	369
Raysor, T. M., Two Unpublished Letters by Coleridge in Contemporary Newspapers.	375
Douglas, T. W., What is the <i>Parlement of Foules</i>	378
Kurrelmeyer, W., Eine Unbekannte Klopstock-Originalausgabe.	384
Noyes, R. G., Mrs. Bracegirdle's Acting in Crowne's <i>Justice Busy</i>	390

CONTENTS

	V
	PAGE
Nock, S. A., Notes on Milton's Appearance.. . . .	391
Gohdes, C., A Note on the Bibliography of Keats.... .	393
Havens, G. R., Voltaire's Marginal Comments upon Pope's <i>Essay on Man</i>	429
Torrey, N. L., A Note on Voltaire's <i>Commentaire historique</i>	439
Rovillain, E., L.-S. Mercier et l' <i>Élégie</i> de Gray.....	442
Raymond, W. O., Browning's First Mention of the Documentary Sources of the <i>Ring and the Book</i>	445
Rice, W. G., <i>The Grand Signiors Serraglio</i> : Written by Master Robert Withers.. . . .	450
Zeydel, E. H., Nachträge zu Holteis <i>Briefe an Tieck</i>	459
Bruns, F., Das Wort 'Physiologisch' bei Goethe.. . . .	464
Lancaster, H. C., A Note on <i>Hernani</i> , IV, 1	467
McKillop, A. D., The First English Translation of <i>Werther</i>	467
Williams, E. B., Three Irregular Portuguese Imperfects.....	468
Krappe, A. H., The Valkyrie Episode in the <i>Njals Saga</i>	471
Malone, K., Some Recent Linguistic Studies	499
Snyder, F. B., A Note on Burns's Language	511
Stearns, Helen, John Skelton and Christopher Garnesche.....	518
Benson, A. B., Baroness Knorring's <i>The Peasant and his Landlord</i> ..	523
Schneider, F., <i>Heinrich Heines Briefwechsel</i> by Friedrich Hirth.....	525
Fogg, W. G., OE. <i>mæȝep</i> in <i>Hali Meidenhad</i>	527
Richardson, Lula M., Old French 'crestange (-me?) bodel' and 'bodel sacelier'.....	529
Dickman, A.-J., <i>Le temps est un songe</i> et l' <i>Intersigne</i> de Villiers ..	531
Pennington, W., An Irish Parallel to the Broken Sword of the Grail Castle.....	534
Rutter, G. M., An Holy Jewes Shepe	536
Hench, A. L., Jefferson and Ossian.. . . .	537
Mustard, W. P., Note on Lyly's <i>Euphues</i>	537

REVIEWS

Georges Ascoli, La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du XVI ^e siècle. [<i>H. C. Lancaster</i>].	49
Franz Rickaby, Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy. [<i>M. B. Ruud</i> .]	51
Archibald Strong, <i>Beowulf</i> . Translated into Modern English Rhyming Verse [<i>M. B. Ruud</i>].	54
Moeller van den Bruck, Goethe. [<i>E. Feise</i>].	55
Hyman Alpern, Guillén de Castro y Bellvis, <i>La Tragedia por los celos</i> . [<i>Esther J. Crooks</i>].	58
C. G. N. De Vooy, Middelnederlandse Legendes en Exempelen. [<i>A. H. Krappe</i>].	61
Beatrice D. Brown, A Study of the Middle English Poem Known as the <i>Southern Passion</i> . [<i>Millicent Carey</i>].	63

	PAGE
Ola Elizabeth Winslow, <i>Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642.</i> [<i>L. B. Wright.</i>]	66
Franziska Fuller, <i>Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen.</i> [<i>J. C. Blankenagel.</i>]	67
Eunice R. Goddard, <i>Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.</i> [<i>Grace Frank.</i>]	69
William F. Giese, <i>Victor Hugo. The Man and the Poet.</i> [<i>B. M. Woodbridge.</i>]	70
P. Chapman, L. Cons, L. Levensgood, W. Vieeland, <i>An Anthology of Seventeenth Century French Literature.</i> [<i>H. Peyre.</i>]	71
G. T. Flom, <i>The Borgatthing Law of the Codex Tunsbergensis.</i> [<i>A. L. Andrews.</i>]	72
W. J. Lawrence, <i>The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse;—Pre-Restoration Stage Studies.</i> [<i>L. B. Wright.</i>] .	118
E. B. Watson, <i>Sheridan to Robertson, A Study of the Nineteenth-Century London Stage.</i> [<i>F. W. Chandler.</i>]	121
G. C. D. Odell, <i>Annals of the New York Stage.</i> [<i>D. MacMullan.</i>] . .	123
N. Göke, <i>Beiträge zur Untersuchung der literarischen und stofflichen Quellen von Immermann's Munchhausen.</i> [<i>A. W. Porterfield.</i>]	125
P. Martino, <i>L'Abbé d'Aubignac, la Pratique du Théâtre.</i> [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	130
H. Teerink, <i>The History of John Bull.</i> [<i>H. M. Dargan.</i>]	132
H. Vaganay, <i>Honoré d'Urfé, l'Astree; M. Magendie, Du Nouveau sur l'Astree.</i> [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	134
E. E. Stoll, <i>Shakespeare Studies.</i> [<i>G. C. Taylor.</i>]	135
E. S. Noyes, <i>The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M. D.</i> [<i>A. W. Secord.</i>]	138
F. von der Leyen, <i>Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung.</i> [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	140
R. D. Waller, <i>The Monks and the Giants</i> , by John Hookham Frere. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>]	142
H. R. Plomer and T. P. Cross, <i>The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett.</i> [<i>E. Grenlaw.</i>]	183
A. Carnóy, <i>La Science du Mot.</i> [<i>O. H. Grandgent.</i>]	186
H. Walker, <i>English Satire and Satirists.</i> [<i>R. C. Whitford.</i>]	187
F. B. Luquiens, <i>Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology.</i> [<i>H. G. Doyle.</i>]	190
R. Levy, <i>The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra.</i> [<i>U. T. Holmes.</i>]	193
Sándor Kémeri, <i>Rambles with Anatole France.</i> [<i>J. M. Carrière.</i>] . . .	194
<i>Acta Philologica Scandinavica.</i> [<i>S. Einarsson.</i>]	196
H. W. Nordmeyer, <i>Eduard Fitzgeralds Rubaiyat des Omar Khayyam.</i> [<i>A. W. Boesche.</i>]	197
H. N. Hillebrand, <i>The Child Actors; T. W. Baldwin, The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company.</i> [<i>G. F. Reynolds.</i>]	199
G. C. L. Schuchard, <i>Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock.</i> [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	202
K. Uhler, <i>Die Bedeutungsähnlichkeit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (-lice).</i> [<i>M. Callaway, Jr.</i>]	203

CONTENTS

vii

PAGE

Mary A. Wyman, Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith. [C. J. Weber].	204
R. D. French, A Chaucer Handbook; G. H. Cowling, Chaucer; W. C. Curry, Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences; K. Sisam, Chaucer: <i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i> . [P. F. Baum].	206
E. B. Reed, Songs from the British Drama. [H. T. Perry].	207
R. H. Hill, The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library. [W. E. Peck].	208
J. F. Bense, Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third. [R. Turner].	210
E. Pons, Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le <i>Conte du Tonneau</i> . [H. M. Dargam].	211
A. E. Powell (Mrs. E. R. Dodds), The Romantic Theory of Poetry. [N. Foerster].	258
F. Stokoe, German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1818. [O. J. Campbell].	262
H. Stephenson, The Ettrick Shepherd: A Biography; Edith C. Batho, The Ettrick Shepherd. [F. E. Pierce].	263
Catherine M. Maclean, Dorothy and William Wordsworth; H. W. Garrod, Wordsworth. [T. M. Raysor].	265
Some Recent American Editions of Old French Texts. [D. S. Blondheim].	266
L. P. Shanks, Flaubert's Youth. [O. Patzer].	269
C. A. Williams, Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite. [A. Taylor].	271
C. Sánchez-Albornoz, Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años. [A. Key].	273
C. C. Marden and F. C. Tarr, A First Spanish Grammar. [J. Robles].	274
Evelyn M. Simpson, A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne; M. Praz, Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra. John Donne, Richard Crashaw; L. C. Martin, The Poems English, Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw, edited. [E. Greenlaw].	275
A. H. Tolman, Falstaff and Other Shakespearean Topics. [C. S. Northup].	278
G. Greig, Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs. [Louise Pound].	280
H. W. Wells, The Realm of Literature. [G. Boas].	281
W. W. Grog, The Calculus of Variants, an Essay on Textual Criticism. [R. K. Root].	283
S. A. Tannenbaum, The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. [T. W. Baldwin].	327
J. S. P. Tatlock and A. G. Kennedy, A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. [R. J. Menner].	332
C. H. Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. [G. R. Coffman].	336
A. Kihlbom, A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I. [J. M. Steadman, Jr.].	338

	PAGE
H. M. Jones, America and French Culture, 1750-1848. [<i>M. Chazin.</i>]	340
L.-P. Geoffrion, Zigzags autour de nos parlers. [<i>J. M. Carrère.</i>]	342
H. L. Stewart, Anatole France, the Parisian. [<i>G. N. Hennings.</i>]	344
H. Girard et H. Moncel, <i>Pour et contre le romantisme.</i> [<i>M. Rudwin.</i>]	346
G. H. Danton, Germany Ten Years After. [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	347
V. Dahlerup, A Ordbog over det danske Sprog. [<i>K. Malone.</i>]	349
H. Hermannsson, Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske. Additions 1913-1926. [<i>L. M. Hollander.</i>]	350
M. J. Van Der Meer, Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache. [<i>E. H. Sehr.</i>]	352
J. Postma, Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists. [<i>L. W. Miles.</i>]	353
W. E. Peck, Shelley, His Life and Work. [<i>A. Koszul.</i>]	394
H. A. White, Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage; J. H. Caskey, The Life and Works of Edward Moore; Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare Improved. [<i>Allardyce Nicoll.</i>]	399
J. W. Cunliffe, Modern English Playwrights. [<i>J. E. Uhler.</i>]	402
H. J. Smith, Oliver Goldsmith's <i>The Citizen of the World</i> ; R. S. Crane, New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. [<i>K. C. Balderston.</i>]	403
Katherine C. Balderston, The History and Sources of Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith.</i> [<i>S. B. Hustvedt.</i>]	405
E. Pons, Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. [<i>K. Malone.</i>]	406
E. Ermatinger, Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung. [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	408
T. R. Palfrey, <i>L'Europe littéraire</i> (1833-1834). [<i>A. Schaffer.</i>]	409
Aristide Marie, Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval. [<i>M. Rudwin.</i>]	411
P. H. Reaney, A Grammar of the Dialect of Penrith. [<i>G. K. Flom.</i>]	412
Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800. [<i>E. Bernbaum.</i>]	416
J. L. Lowes, The Road to Xanadu. [<i>Alice D. Snyder.</i>]	426
A. J. Perry, <i>Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum</i> by John Trevisa; F. A. Foster, A Stanzaic Life of Christ; B. Wendell, The History of the Translation of the Martyrs. [<i>G. H. Gerould.</i>]	475
E. Weekley, Surnames; Romance of Words; G. P. Krappe, Knowledge of English; R. E. Zachrisson, Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time; G. C. van Langenhove, Origin of the Gerund in English. [<i>W. F. Bryan.</i>]	478
E. K. Chambers, Arthur of Britain; R. E. Zachrisson, Romans, Kelts and Saxons. [<i>K. Malone.</i>]	481
G. Cohen, Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Age. [<i>L. Cons.</i>]	484
F. E. Pierce and C. F. Schreiber, Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance; K. Breul, The Romantic Movement in German Literature. [<i>A. W. Porterfield.</i>]	486
C. W. Beaumont, The History of Harlequin; C. Mic, La Commedia dell'arte. [<i>W. Smith.</i>]	489
Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk. [<i>S. Einarsson.</i>]	490

CONTENTS

	ix PAGE
M. S. Steele, Plays and Masques; E. Welsford, The Court Masque. [<i>L. B. Wright.</i>]	492
C. P. Cambiaire, Poe in France. [<i>K. Campbell.</i>]	493
E. J. Morley, Correspondence of H. C. Robinson; G. L. Bickersteth, Leopardi and Wordsworth; H. C. White, The Mysticism of William Blake. [<i>G. McL. Harper.</i>]	538
E. W. Gordon, An Introduction to Old Norse. [<i>S. Einarsson.</i>]	542
C. F. Richardson, English Preachers and Preaching. [<i>A. Warren.</i>] . .	545
W. C. Frierson, L'influence du Naturalisme français sur les Ro- manciers anglais. [<i>A. Chevalley.</i>]	547
A. Von Helmholtz-Phelan, The Social Philosophy of William Morris. [<i>E. B. Burgum.</i>]	548
F. T. Russell, One Word More on Browning. [<i>H. E. Greene.</i>] . . .	550
W. C. DeVane, Browning's Parleyings. [<i>F. T. Russell.</i>]	552
A. Cortés, La Muerte del Conde de Villamediana. [<i>J. P. W. Craw- ford.</i>]	553
D. H. Stevens, Milton Papers. [<i>J. H. Hanford.</i>]	555
R. E. Spiller, The American in England. [<i>K. B. Murdock.</i>]	556
W. F. Gruffydd, Math Vab Mathonwy; A. H. Krappe, Balor with the Evil Eye. [<i>R. S. Loomis.</i>]	558
D. Mornet, la Nouvelle Héloïse. [<i>L. Cons.</i>]	560
T. E. Oliver, The 'Merope' of Jeffreys as a source of Voltaire's 'Mérope.' [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	561
H. R. Patch, The Goddess Fortuna. [<i>S. L. Galpin.</i>]	563
H. Lohre, W. Müller als Kritiker und Erzähler. [<i>J. T. Hatfield.</i>] . .	564
S. Brooke, On Ten Plays of Shakespeare. [<i>H. S. V. Jones.</i>]	566

BRIEF MENTION

G. C. Faber, The Poetical Works of John Gay. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>] .	143
E. L. Chandler, Sources of the Tales and Romances written by Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853. [<i>L. Howard.</i>]	143
E. Partridge, The Three Wartons. [<i>C. Rinaker.</i>]	143
A. Gray, A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare. [<i>L. B. Wright.</i>]	144
O. Schulthess, Briefe von C. F. Meyer. [<i>E. Feise.</i>]	144
W. A. Nitze and E. P. Dargan, A History of French Literature. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	211
H. Ashion, A Preface to Molière. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	212
D. O'Connor, Louise Labé. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>]	212
R. S. Crane, F. B. Kaye, and M. E. Prior, A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>]	212
J. Crofts, Gray, Poetry and Prose;	} [<i>A. D. McKillop.</i>] 213
M. K. Bragg, The Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth- Century England;	
E. Partridge, A Critical Medley;	

	PAGE
E. Seillière, Pour le centenaire du romantisme. [<i>M. Rudwin.</i>].....	214
D. Mornet, Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée françaises contemporaines. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>].....	284
E. Hartl, Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival. [<i>W. Kuntze.</i>].....	285
M. A. Thiel, La figure de Saül dans la littérature dramatique française. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>].....	285
R. A. Hesselgrave, Lady Miller and the Bathaston Literary Circle. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>].....	286
H. G. Fiedler, Das Oxforder Buch Deutscher Dichtung. [<i>E. Feise.</i>]..	286
F. Mistral (Neveu), Adolphe Dumas. [<i>L. Landré.</i>].....	354
F. McD. C. Turner, The Element of Irony in English Literature. [<i>R. D. Havens.</i>].....	355
J. Plattard, Etat présent des études rabelaisiennes. [<i>H. C. Lancaster.</i>].....	356
M. E. Chase, Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. [<i>R. P. Boas.</i>]..	356
A. L. Herold, J. K. Paulding. [<i>T. O. Mabbott.</i>].....	495
Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell. [<i>L. Hotson.</i>].....	496
H. C. Wyld, A Short History of English. [<i>R. Willard.</i>].....	496
L. Brandin, La Chanson d'Aspremont. [<i>D. S. Blondheim.</i>].....	497
R. Paget, The Nature of Human Speech. [<i>J. S. Kenyon.</i>].....	498
A Correction.....	498
E. Fischer, Der Lautbestand des südmitteleuropäischen Octavian. [<i>R. Willard.</i>].....	567
L. E. Armstrong and I. C. Ward, English Intonation. [<i>M. B. Ruud.</i>].....	567
A. Treneer, The Sea in English Literature. [<i>M. B. Ruud.</i>].....	568
H. R. Steeves, Literary Aims and Art. [<i>H. S. V. Jones.</i>].....	568
H. Koht, Henrik Ibsen. [<i>A. B. Zucker.</i>].....	569
J. B. Orrick, Matthew Arnold and Goethe. [<i>F. Bruns.</i>].....	570
<hr/>	
Index.....	571
Recent Publications.....	i-xl

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

JANUARY, 1928

Number 1

NEUE WIELAND-DOPPELDRUCKE

In den Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie, 1913,¹ habe ich auf die Bedeutung der Doppeldrucke für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken hingewiesen, und dabei wiederholt die Vermutung ausgesprochen, dass sich im Laufe der Zeit noch andere Drucke auffinden wurden. Ein im Jahre 1918 herausgegebener Nachtrag² bestätigte bald diese Vermutung. Inzwischen habe ich wieder eine Anzahl neuer Drucke erworben, die hier beschrieben werden sollen.

ZWÖLF MORALISCHE BRIEFE IN VERSEN. 1752.

Schon ausserlich unterscheiden sich die hier in Betracht kommenden Drucke durch den Titel: *Franckfurt und Leipzig, zu finden bey Frantz Joseph Eckebrecht, 1752.* (E^a), *Franckfurt und Leipzig, verlegt Franz Joseph Eckebrecht, 1752.* (E^b). Es kommen auch Exemplare vor mit der Firma: *verlegt Johann Christoph Löffler, 1752*, die ich jedoch nicht gesehen habe. Goedeke, Grundriss iv, i, 545, 4, ist der Meinung dass alle drei Gattungen, abgesehen von den Titelblättern, denselben Druck darstellen: diese Ansicht ist jedoch falsch. *Prolegomena*³ VII, 8 gibt Seuffert eine

¹ *Die Doppeldrucke in ihrer Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken.* Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1913, Phil.-Hist. Classe, No. 7. Berlin, 1913.

² "Nachtrag zur Wieland-Bibliographie," *Modern Language Notes*, XXXIII, 282-293 (1918).

³ *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe I-VII.* Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften vom Jahre 1904, 1905, 1908, 1909, 1921 Berlin, 1904-1921. Die Mitteilungen des österr. Vereins f. Bibliothekswesen, 10, 76 ff., auf die Seuffert sich bezieht, sind mir nicht zugänglich.

Beschreibung der Drucke, mit knappem Variantenverzeichnis, welches jedoch keine zwingenden Schlüsse auf die Priorität des einen oder des anderen Druckes gestattet. Seufferts Ansicht, dass der Druck mit den zweierlei Verlagsfirmen (E^a) der ursprüngliche sein müsse, wird durch folgende Lesarten bestätigt, dagegen hat Homeyer in der Akademie-Ausgabe⁴ den fehlervollen Doppel-druck E^b als Grundlage benutzt:

Bl.) (2, Z. 5 unsterblicher Triebe E^a, unendlicher Triebe E^b. S. 5, 9 durch Bessern E^a durch besser E^b. 13, 18 Anmuth zum Vergnügen E^a Annuth und Vergnügen E^b. 25, 22 grbauchte E^b Drf. 26, 20 Freygebigkeis E^a Drf. 29, 16 Geldgeiz E^a Geldgeitz E^b. 39, 10 furchtbaren Gewittern E^a fruchtbaren Gewittern E^b. 52, 10 dein Lied E^a ein Lied E^b. 78, 19 Schildeteyen E^b Drf. 79, 11 wirklich E^a wirklich E^b. 83, 3 Mädchens E^a Mädgens E^b. 94, 11 Plutarch noch Aelian E^a Plutarch und Aelian E^b. 102, 7 der Tejer singt E^a der Tejer findt E^b. 102, 20 Samischer E^a Samarischer E^b. 115, 9 wagt ichs E^a wagt ich E^b. 124, 12 Würmern E^a Würmen E^b. 125, 22 zuverlässigste E^a zuverlässige E^b. 127, 5 unedelm E^a unedlem E^b. 136, 10 bewegeet E^a bewegt E^b. 142, 4 in seinen Arm E^a in seinem Arm E^b. 149, 25 haben E^a hat E^b. 151, 22 mit wenigern Sonnen E^a mit weniger Sonnen E^b.

Wenn wir nun einige von diesen Stellen näher ins Auge fassen, so erhellt sofort, dass E^a den richtigen, ursprünglicheren Text bietet; z. B. S. 13, 17 f.:

So, Freundin, reizt an dir aus edlen holden Zügen
Zur Ehrfurcht Majestät, und Anmuth zum Vergnügen.

Die verderbte Lesart von E^b: *Majestät, und Anmuth und Vergnügen* ist in die Akademie-Ausgabe (I. Brief, v, 192) hinübergenommen.

S. 39, 10:

Sie stärket unsern Muth in furchtbaren Gewittern;

Daraus macht E^b: *fruchtbaren Gewittern*; (= Akademie III, 44), also Unsinn, denn nur in furchtbaren Gewittern braucht sie, d. h.

⁴ Wielands Werke. 1 Bd. Poetische Jugendwerke, 1. Teil, Berlin, 1909.

die Weisheit, unsern Muth zu stärken, nicht in befruchtenden Regenschauern.

S. 52, 8 ff.:

Wenn sich der Herscher Ruhm in unbekannten Gräften
Mit ihrer Asche mischt, des Moders freyes Spiel,
Lebt noch ein Tullius, nutzt noch dein Lied, Virgil.

Daraus macht E^b: *nützt noch ein Lied*, eine Lesart, die Homeyer (iv, 74) stillschweigend verbessert hat, ohne E^a zu kennen.

S. 94, 11 f.:

Kein Diogen, kein Liv, Plutarch noch Aelian
Zeigt mir den Glüklichen, der Weisen Phönix, an.

Dafür setzt E^b: *Plutarch und Aelian* (= Akad. VII, 197) eine unmögliche Lesart, besonders wegen des vorhergehenden 'kein.'

S. 102, 7:

Der Weise nur ist schön. Was auch der Tejer singt,
Kein Kleobulus ist dem hier der Streit gelingt,
Wenn sich Aesop ihm stellt.

Daraus macht E^b: *Was auch der Tejer findt*, was nur als Lesefehler zu erklären ist, der nun auch in der Akademie-Ausgabe wiederkehrt (VIII, 45).

S. 102, 20, Anm. 4: *Gleichfalls ein Samischer Knabe, dessen Gemähde Anakreon in der 29. Ode mit Meisterzügen entwirft*. Dafür setzt E^b: *ein Samarischer Knabe* (so noch in Akad., Anm. zu VIII, 49). Dass Anakreon, der auf Samos lebte, nicht mit Samaria in Verbindung zu bringen ist, leuchtet wohl ohne weiteres ein.

S. 125, 22, Anm. 2: *Xenophon, der uns das zuverlässigste vom Leben des Sokrates hinterlassen hat*. Dafür hat E^b den Druckfehler *zuverlässige*, der auch in die Akademie-Ausgabe (Anm. zu x, 48) übergegangen ist.

S. 142, 4:

Hier eilt in seinen Arm der weisen Freunde Heer,

anstatt dessen E^b: *in seinem Arm liest* (so auch Akad. x, 290). Dass der Dativ hier unmöglich ist, wird wohl ohne weiteres zugegeben werden.

S. 154, 22, Anm.: *nach den Ideen derjenigen Sternkündiger*

beschrieben, welche sie (d. h., die Milchstrasse) vor eine unendliche Menge mit wenigern Sonnen vermischter Planeten hatten; anstatt wenigern hat E^b den Druckfehler weniger, den Homeyer (Anm. zu XI, 152) in wenigen verbessert.

Dass also E^a durchweg die bessere, ursprüngliche Lesart habe, wird wohl kaum zu bezweifeln sein. Folglich ist auch dies der frühere Druck: Seuffert meint zwar (*Prolegomena*, VII, 8), "der spätere Neudruck kann einen verständigeren und dazu achtsameren Setzer oder Korrektor gefunden haben, als es der Verfasser war, falls er überhaupt beim Druck mitwirkte," aber dies lässt sich nur für den Einzelfall annehmen, nie für einen ganzen Band. Und in diesem Falle hatte der damalige Korrektor noch achtsamer sein müssen als ein jetziger Herausgeber einer kritischen Ausgabe, der, durch den unechten Doppeldruck irre geführt, nur an einer einzigen von den hier besprochenen Stellen die ursprüngliche Lesart herstellen konnte.

MUSARION, LEIPZIG, 1769.

Zu den fünf früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{2abede} treten zwei neue, E^{2fg}. Keiner von den bis jetzt bekannten späteren Drucken scheint nachgewirkt zu haben, die Ausgabe letzter Hand geht anscheinend auf den Originaldruck E^{2a} zurück. Lesarten: S. II, 12 wenn ich . . . setze E^{2a} wenn er . . . setze E^{2bdefg}. VI, 12 Scheu E^{2abedog} Scheu E^{2f} Drf. IX, 3, 4 gezüchtigt E^{2abcd} gezüchtigt E^{2efg}. X, 6 blendt E^{2abcg} blendet E^{2ef}. 5, 19 Empfindungslos E^{2abedg} Empfindungslos E^{2ef}. 7, 17 Übermaas E^{2g} Drf. 14, 20 entdeckte E^{2f} Drf. 25, 3 verzeihenswerth E^{2f} Drf. 35, 7 und 71, 2 doch E^{2abcd} noch E^{2efg}. 54, 1 Augenwinkel E^{2aefg} Augwinkel E^{2bcd}. 63, 14 allgemach E^{2abdef} allegemach E^{2g}. 71, 10 ljbliches E^{2g} Drf. 72, 5 Espladian E^{2abcd} Espladian E^{2ofg}. 105, 15 fast E^{2abedg} faßt E^{2ef}. 116, 13 kein Aug' gehört, kein Ohr gesehen E^{2abd} kein Ohr gehört, kein Aug' gesehen E^{2oefg}. 116, 15 handgriflich E^{2g} Drf. 124, 7 Garten, den E^{2a} Garten, der E^{2bdefg}. 125, 11 andres E^{2abcd} anders E^{2efg}.

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ ΜΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Zu den vier früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{abcd} kommen noch zwei neue, E^{ef}. Der Druck E^e steht eigentlich dem Originaldruck E^a am nächsten, so dass die richtige Reihenfolge E^{aebcd} wäre. In

E^e laufen die beiden Halften der Kopfleiste symmetrisch nach rechts und links, nur S. 228, 266, 296 sind sie nach rechts, und S. 149 verkehrt, nach innen, gerichtet. Falsche Seitenzahlen finden sich: 81 anstatt 18; 234 anstatt 237; 205 anstatt 250. Der andere neue Druck, E^f, der jüngste von allen bis jetzt bekannten, lässt sich leicht erkennen, indem hier nur die halbe Kopfleiste vorkommt, die ausnahmslos nach rechts gerichtet ist.

Als Vorlage für die Ausgabe letzter Hand hat E^c, oder ein ähnlicher, noch unbekannter Druck gedient, dessen Änderungen durchweg rückgängig zu machen sind. Lesarten: S. 15, 10 maschinenmäßige E^{ae} maschinenmäßige E^{bcd^f}. 25, 1 Character E^{abce} Charakter E^{d^f}. 40, 17.18 hüten? E^a hüten; E^{bcd^{ef}}. 48, 20 bloß E^{abce} bloß E^f. 54, 12 sauge E^{ae} fange E^{bcd^f}. 79, 8 auszuschmücken E^{abce^f} auszuschmützen E^f. 114, 3 zn thun E^e Drf. 114, 5.15 Corinthier E^{abce} Corinthen E^{d^f}. 128, 20 spat gehohlt hatte E^{ae} spät gehohlt hatte E^{bcd} spät gehohlt hatte E^f. 203, 2 schiefen Begriffen E^{abe} falschen Begriffen E^{cd^f}C. 248, 14 oder zwar gebohren aber nicht erwachsen E^{abe}: *der Satz fehlt* E^{cd^f}C weil der Setzer E^c auf *oder zwar* der folgenden Zeile abirrte. 254, 15 zu thun genug hätte E^{ae} zu thun gehabt hätte E^{bcd^f}.

BEYTRÄGE ZUR GEHEIMEN GESCHICHTE DES MENSCHLICHEN
VERSTANDES UND HERZENS, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Der neue, mit E^e zu bezeichnende Druck sollte eigentlich zwischen E^{ab} und E^{cd} eingereiht werden. Seine Lesarten gehen auf E^c über und von hier auf die Ausgabe letzter Hand. Äusserlich ist er E^c ähnlich, indem die Kopfleiste (siehe *Doppeldrucke*, S. 12) durchweg übereinstimmt: nur auf S. 72 des zweiten Theiles hat E^e die Leiste nach links, E^c nach rechts. Lesarten:

I. Theil: S. 7, 7 zu Bürgermeister E^{ab} zum Bürgermeister E^{cde}. 9, 2 euch E^{abce} auch E^d. 19, 18 dnrrch E^e Drf. 25, 19 Getümmel E^a Drf. 36, 15. 16 aufestülpte E^e Drf. 43, 8 Gründe E^{abce} Grundsätze E^d. 45, 18 erfodert E^{ab} erfordert E^{cde}. 47, 16 ber Wärme E^a Drf. 68, 9 auffallende E^{ab} ausfallende E^{cde}. 68, 13 bedenken E^{ab} denken E^{cde}. 69, 10 sich E^{abce} sie E^d. 72, 16 Alphabets E^{acd} Alphabets E^{be}. 81, 10 Masüthim E^a Masülhim E^{bcd^e}. 82, 5 Augensprache E^a Aussprache E^{bcd^e}. 84, 12 ferdig ssnd E^d Drf. 87, 6 heterogenen E^a betrogenen E^{bcd^e}. 87, 16 ausarbeitet E^{ab} ausbreitet E^{cde}. 92, 10 wie er E^{ad} wie es E^{bce}. 93, 1 geometrisch-

E^{abcd} geometrich- E^e. 178, 7 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}. 212, 16 werden E^{abcd} werten E^e *Drf.*

II. Theil: S. 34, 12 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}. 36, 13 der Menschheit E^{abce} von Menschheit E^d. 67, 9 solchem Maße E^a solcher Maße E^{bcd}. 99, 18 gedaurt E^{abe} gedauert E^{cd}. 109, 16 Wissenstrieb E^{abd} Wissenstrieb E^{ce}. 124, 16 ddr Basiliade E^e *Drf.* 130, 6 Gelübde E^{ad} Geliebte E^{bce} *Drf.* 138, 15 Antoninus E^{abd} Antonius E^{ce}. 164, 18 ordentlichen E^{abcd} ordentlicher E^e. 176, 3. 9 Paris E^{abe} Paris E^{cd}. 177, 16 genug E^a genug E^{bcd}: *an 9 weiteren Stellen dieselbe Lesart.* 178, 9 unteschieden E^e *Drf.* 182, 4 Rubiuen E^e *Drf.* 186, 15 ebn so E^e *Drf.* 188, 16 dem Staat E^{abcd} den Staat E^e. 196, 2 Sterb- lichen E^{abcd} Sterb- chen E^e *Drf.* 201, 1 unmmenschliche E^e *Drf.* 214, 5 erfodert E^{ab} erfordert E^{cde}. 220, 12 arkadischen E^{acd} arkadischer E^{be}. 225, 5 emporstrebenden E^{ab} emporstehenden E^{cde}. 226, 2 Thätigkeit E^{ab} Thätlichkeit E^{cde}. 227, 20 Vervollkommung E^{abe} Vervollkommnung E^{cd}.

COMBABUS, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Die vier bisher bekannten Drucke haben alle einen geraden Doppelstrich als Kopfleiste, der neu hinzukommende Druck E^e hat dagegen die halbe, bei dem Druck E^f des Sokrates vorkommende Leiste, die hier stets nach rechts gerichtet ist. Die Drucke E^{bde} scheinen jeder direkt von E^a abzustammen, während E^c, von welchem die Ausgabe letzter Hand abstammt, E^b als Vorlage benutzte. Lesarten: S. 3, 10 ins Nichts E^{abde} in Nichts E^c. 4, 3 eine Circe E^{ade} ein Circe E^{be}. 4, 5 Crates E^{abcd} Carles E^e. 12, 5 aus seinen E^{ade} aus seinem E^{be}. 12, 7 seinen Scherz E^{ade} keinen Scherz E^{be}. 14, 12 Crone E^{abce} Krone E^d. 20, 7 dein eignes E^{abcd} dein eigen E^e. 21, 4 rief er wild E^{abcd} rief er mild E^e. 22, 17 Combabus thun, um E^{ad} Combabus thun, und E^{be} Combabus thun, um E^e. 24, 17 minders E^{abd} minder E^{ce}; *anf E^a Drf.* 25, 2 Liebesgottt E^b *Drf.* 27, 18 Combab E^{abc} Combab E^d Cambab E^e. 31, 19 liebt E^{abcd} lieöt E^e *Drf.* 38, 10 die- sen E^{ae} diesen E^{bcd}. 39, 3 gescha- det E^{ae} geschadet E^{bcd}. 46, 2 ohne E^{abcd} yhne E^e *Drf.* 46, 17 Astarte E^{acde} Astarde E^b. 51, 20 Kniee E^{abde} Knie E^e. 52, 1. 2 vorange- schickt. E^{abe} vorange- schickt, E^c voran- geschickt. E^d. 58, 17 Combabens E^{abde} Combabus E^e. 62, 6 bittet ihm . . . ab E^{abcd} bittet ihn . . . ab E^e.

62, 7 vom Anschein E^{ade} von Anschein E^{bc}. 63, 2. 3 ein Op-| fer E^{abe} ein| Opfer E^c ein Opfer| E^d.

POETISCHE SCHRIFTEN DES HERRN WIELANDS. DRITTE VERB.

AUFL., ZÜRICH, 1770. DRITTER BAND.

Doppeldrucke S. 13 gab ich eine Auswahl aus den Lesarten des ersten und zweiten Bandes der Drucke B² und B³, woraus man folgern durfte, dass B³ ein einfacher Doppeldruck sei, der ohne Mitwirken des Dichters veranstaltet worden war. Dasselbe lässt sich von dem inzwischen erworbenen dritten Bande sagen: auch hier ist B³ eine Fehlerquelle für die Ausgabe letzter Hand, die von diesem Drucke abstammt. Lesarten: S. 15, 30 diß B² dieß B³. 17, 9 einmals B^{1 2} einmals B³ C¹. 20, 29 verklärt' B² verklärt B³: *ahnlich* 21, 21 hebt'; 21, 27 eilt'; 29, 10 bebt'; 30, 5 sagt'. 22, 9 auf jeglichem B^{1 2} an jeglichem B³ C¹. 23, 10 befallen; B^{1 2} befallen? B³ C¹. 30, 4 Stärke sie dann, erbarmender Schöpfer, damit sie nicht sterbe! B^{1 2}: *der ganze Vers* (I, 447) *fehlt* B³ C¹. In C¹ wurde dann der Anfang des folgenden Verses geandert. um den Sinn herzustellen. 38, 16 Isca B^{1 2} Isac B³ *Drf.* 44, 29 zur Erde B^{1 2} zu Erde B³. 46, 6 Herzen B^{1 2} Herze B³ Herz C¹. 106, 17 sechszehnden B² sechszehnten B³. 108, 1 Nennt B^{1 2} Nenn B³. 108, 31 gebohren wardst B^{1 2} gebohren warst B³. 113, 20 rinsumgeben B² *Drf.* ringsumgeben B³. 128, 9 Geheimmniß B² *Drf.* 136, 23 unglukl'ge B^{1 2} ungluksel'ge B³. 138, 14 gesandt, sich B² gesandt, die B³ *Drf.* 142, 9 würden B² würde B³ *Drf.* 192, 17 erfodert B² erfordert B³. 207, 5 Erbgut B² Erdgut B³ *Drf.* 209, 33 Schauerte B^{1 2} Schauderte B³ C¹. 210, 26 Ueberschaut B² Uederschaut B³ *Drf.* 210, 33 Augen der der meisten B² *Drf.* Augen der meisten B³. 212, 1 Lorrbeern B² Lorbeern B³. 214, 31 des Lager B² *Drf.* das Lager B^{1 3}. 215, 33 kriegerischen B² C¹ kriegerischen B³.

DIE GRAZIEN, LEIPZIG, 1770.

Zu den fünf früher beschriebenen Drucken tritt jetzt ein sechster (E^f), der sich schon äusserlich von den andern unterscheidet, indem hier nur die halbe Kopfleiste gebraucht wird, die mit Ausnahme der Seiten 113, 157, 179 nach rechts gerichtet ist (Vgl. den Druck E^d der *Beyträge*, 1770). Lesarten: S. 5, 15 Ihrem E^{abede} ihrem E^f. 6, 2 Ihnen E^{abede} ihnen E^f. 7, 5 wollten; E^a

Interpunktion verkehrt. 11, 8 letzten E^{abde} letztern E^f. 20, 6. 7 Schäferinnen E^d Drf. 30, 11 Hayns E^{aef} Hahns E^{bed}. 46, 9 goldener E^{abde} goldner E^f. 53, 8 will ich E^{abc} ich will E^{def}. 67, 6 vor E^{abde} von E^f 84, 4 gesungen E^{abde} gefunden E^f. 93, 12 eh sie E^a es sie E^{bed} da sie E^{ef}. 110, 2 diese schöne E^{abc} die schöne E^{def} C¹. 138, 15 dolcezza E^{abc} dolcezza E^{def}. 173, 3 Um alle E^{abc} Und alle E^{def}. 174, 5 glaublich E^a Drf. glaubet E^{abde} glaubt E^f. 176, 15 vermandt E^a Drf. verwandt E^{bedef}. 178, 2 steht E^a sieht E^{bedef}. 179, 3 kindlich E^{abc} kleindlich E^d kleinlich E^f. 197, 16 bezaubernden E^{abde} bezauberten E^f. 205, 4 Im Geiste E^{abde} In Geiste E^f.

GESCHICHTE DES FRÄULFINS VON STERNHEIM, LEIPZIG, 1771.

In seinem Neudruck des von Wieland herausgegebenen Romans der La Roche (DLB. 138) stellt Ridderhoff drei Drucke des Jahres 1771 fest: dabei wird der korrekteste derselben (C) als jüngster angesehen, und zur Grundlage des Textes gemacht. Die wenigen von Ridderhoff mitgeteilten Lesarten gestatten keine sichere Identifizierung mit den drei mir vorliegenden Exemplaren: wenn z. B. Ridderhoffs Angabe (S. xxxviii) richtig ist, dass die anderen Ausgaben (also seine Drucke ABC) *Denkungsart* lesen, so sind ihm meine Drucke E^{bc} unbekannt geblieben, während mir nur Einer von seinen drei Drucken ABC vorliegt.

Schon die Kopfleisten gestatten eine schnelle und sichere Unterscheidung der verschiedenen Drucke: im allgemeinen laufen die beiden Hälften symmetrisch nach rechts und links. Ausnahmen: in E^a laufen auf S. 100, 136, 166, 206, 218, 254, 272, 302, 328 des ersten Bandes beide Hälften nach links, und auf S. 111, 113, 145, 191, 195, 239, 269, 291, 335 sind beide verkehrt, nach innen gerichtet; in E^b sind die beiden Hälften nur auf S. 105, 141 verkehrt, nach innen gerichtet; in E^c geht die Leiste ohne Ausnahme symmetrisch nach rechts und links.

Lesarten. Da für unsere Zwecke hauptsächlich die von Wieland geschriebene Vorrede in Betracht kommt, so sind folgende Lesarten sämtlich dem ersten Bande entnommen: S. iv, 17 Character E^a Charakter E^{bc}. v, 8 fühle, E^a Drf. fühle. E^{bc}. v, 9 für Sie E^{ab} für sie E^c. v, 15 tugendhafteen E^a Drf. v, 19 Freundin! E^a Freundin; E^{bc}. vi, 1 wirklich E^a wirklich E^{bc}. vi, 6 Geschenke E^{ac} Geschenke E^b. vi, 14 Nntzen E^a Drf. vi, 20 überflüssig E^a über-

flußig E^{bc}. vi, 22 Andre E^a Andere E^{bc}. viii, 18 Denkensart E^a
Denkungsart E^{bc}. x, 7 sind! E^a sind; E^{bc}. xiii, 8 Ihnen E^a ihnen
E^{bc}. xiv, 21 Bewustseyn E^a Bewußtseyn E^{bc}. xv, 9 Männer E^a
Männern E^{bc} *Drf.* xvi, 13 angelegten E^a ausgelegten E^{bc}. xviii,
5 ihre E^{ab} ihrer E^c. xix, 6 Schönheiteen E^b *Drf.* xxi, 13 soviel E^a
so viel E^{bc}. xxi, 16 denen es gar E^a denen gar E^{bc}. xxii, 9 weche
E^b *Drf.* 2, 12 verband ihn E^a verband ihm E^{bc} *Drf.* 5, 1 Lady E^{ab}
Layd E^c *Drf.* 6, 4 genaueste E^{ab} genauste E^c. 6, 6. 7 Besor- | gniß
E^{ab} Besorg- | niß E^c. 7, 24 die Frage E^a diese Frage E^{bc}. 12, 2
ihre E^a Ihre E^{bc}. 12, 13 Ihr E^a ihr E^{bc}. 16, 22 Nahmens E^a
Namens E^{bc}. 24, 7 zärtlichen E^a zärtlichsten E^{bc}. 25, 23 Unmög-
lich! E^a Unmöglich, E^{bc}. 27, 23 entsagen! E^a entsagen? E^{bc}. 32,
9 mißhandelt E^a gemißhandelt E^{bc}. 32, 12 mißbraucht E^a gemiß-
braucht E^{bc}. 33, 3 leichte E^{ab} leicht E^c. 34, 9 allen E^a allein E^{bc}
Drf. 35, 16 schuldig! E^a schuldig? E^{bc}. 37, 9 weis E^a weiß E^{bc}.
41, 4 Gemahln: E^a Gemahlin! E^{bc}. 41, 12; 48, 14 gewiedmet E^a
gewidmet E^{bc}. 43, 6 weil ich E^{ab} weil es E^c *Drf.* 45, 2 Zeitpunkt
E^a Zeitpunkt E^{bc}. 45, 21 Militar-Diensten E^{ab} Militär-Diensten
E^c. 46, 9 itzige E^a itzigen E^{bc}. 46, 13 leicht sind E^a leicht ist E^{bc}.
46, 24 herausgezogen worden bin E^a herausgezogen bin E^{bc}. 49,
13 ihrem Nächsten E^a ihren Nächsten E^{bc}. 53, 19 Fußstapfen E^a
Fußstapfen E^{bc} (*vgl.* 78, 6). 57, 12 Weibspersonen E^a Weibespersonen
E^{bc}. 60, 19 vom wahren E^a von wahren E^{bc}. 61, 8 von P., aus, kom-
men E^a von P. aus kommen, E^{bc}. 62, 3 von Regierung E^a von der
Regierung E^{bc}. 69, 3 allem was E^a allem, was E^b allem, was E^c:
das m verkehrt. 69, 17 hatte E^a hat E^{bc}. 75, 22 Schmerzens E^{ab}
Schmerzens, E^c. 78, 6 Fußstapfen E^a Fußstapfen E^{bc} (*vgl.* 53, 19).
78, 14 Thräneu E^c *Drf.* 80, 7 Grosmutter E^a Großmutter E^{bc}.

ALCESTE, LEIPZIG, 1773.

Schon äusserlich unterscheidet sich der neu hinzukommende
Druck E^d von den früher beschriebenen Drucken E^{abc}, dadurch
dass in jenem die (halbe) Kopfleiste ausnahmslos nach rechts
gerichtet ist: in E^{ab} ist die Leiste nach links (in E^b mit Aus-
nahme der Seiten 13, 43, 71), in E^c dagegen regellos nach rechts
oder links gerichtet. Der Druck E^d stammt von E^c oder einem
ähnlichen Drucke ab, und ist der jüngste von allen bis jetzt be-
kannten. Nachwirkung auf die Ausgabe letzter Hand ist nicht
festzustellen. Lesarten: S. 7, 7 erschließe E^a *Drf.* 11, 18 O mein

E^{abc} O! mein E^d. 17, 6 gebahren E^{abc} geboren E^d. 19, 4 Stirbt — E^{abc} Stirb — E^d. weißt E^{ab} weißt E^d. 27, 9 zu sehn E^{abc} zu seyn E^d. 27, 13 schrecklichsten E^{ab} schrecklichen E^d. 27, 14 Nicht E^{abc} Nichts E^d. 36, 6 In denen E^{abc} In deinem E^d. 48, 1 Admet; E^{ab} Admet! E^d. 49, 14 Kleinmuthiger E^{ab} Kleinmüthig E^d. 54, 11 stößt E^a floßt E^{bed}. 56, 4 Schale E^{abc} Schaale E^d. 62, 8 Admet E^a Alceste E^{bed}. 65, 5 Umgangs E^{abd} Umgans E^c. 76, 15 Princessin E^{abc} Princessinn E^d. 77, 1 haben; E^{ab} haben? E^d. 77, 9 entschlüpfen! E^a entschlüpfen? E^{bed}. 81, 11 ihn ewig, ewig dauren E^{ab} ihn ewig, dauren E^c ihn ewig dauren E^d.

PEREGRINUS PROTEUS, LEIPZIG, 1791.

In den "Nachtragen" (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxviii, 291 ff.) habe ich auf das Vorhandensein einer geringeren Ausgabe hingewiesen: hier handelt es sich um einen seitengleichen Doppeldruck (E^b)⁵ der guten Ausgabe, der äußerlich genau mit dem Originaldruck E^a übereinstimmt—nur ist das Papier in E^b etwas dünner. Der Originaldruck E^a kennzeichnet sich als solchen durch genauere Übereinstimmung mit dem *Merkur* (J); vereinzelt kehren die Lesarten des jüngeren Druckes E^b in C¹ wieder, ohne dass direkte Abstammung als sicher anzunehmen wäre. Die geringere Ausgabe E^c stammt direkt von E^a ab. Lesarten:

ERSTER THEIL. S. 31, 15 schiffte E^a schifftr E^b *Drf.* 74, 9 bald E^a *Drf.* bald E^b. 88, 1 verwaltete E^a verwaltete E^b. 91, 18 ehemals E^a ehemals E^b. 96, 11 ihrer E^a Ihrer E^b *Drf.* 113, 2 einigen Argwohn JE^aC¹ einen Argwohn E^b. 115, 7 andre E^a andere E^b. 128, 12 genöthigt E^a genöthiget E^b. 158, 13 Sott der Gonne E^a *Drf.* Gott der Sonne E^b. 185, 14 erfodert E^a erfordert E^b. 192, 7. 8 etlichen E^a *Drf.* 193, 1 Schale E^a Schaale E^b. 193, 19 Terrasse E^a Terasse E^b. 201, 10 Golddraht E^a Golddrath E^b. 204, 15 ehemaliger E^a ehemaliger E^b. 209, 4 zerfließen E^a *Drf.* zerfließen E^b. 237, 14 meiner E^b *Drf.* 242, 18 vollkommnerer E^aC¹ vollkommner E^b. 251, 6 die sie E^a die sich E^b *Drf.* 251, 19 villeicht E^a *Drf.* 272, 1 schönen E^aC¹ schönsten E^b. 290, 1 bedauern E^a bedauren E^b. 294, 10 Gunstbezeugungen E^aC¹ Gunstbezeugungen E^b. 311, 16 Denkensart JE^a Denkungsart E^bC¹.

⁵ Nachtrag S. 291 wurde diese Sigle der geringeren Ausgabe zugewiesen: nunmehr wird letztere mit E^c bezeichnet.

319, 16 mir ihren E^a mit ihren E^b *Drf.* 320, 15 schmählichen E^a schmählichen E^b. 335, 3 hätten E^a hatte E^bC¹. 340, 18 auferstandnen E^a auferstandenen E^b. 345, 4. 5 amüsieren E^a amüsiren E^b. 350, 20 bedeckt E^a dedeckt E^b *Drf.* Anstatt 315 hat E^b die Seitenzahl 31.

ZWEYTER THEIL. S. 4, 17 ehemalige E^a ehemalige E^b. 16, 11 mußte E^a muste E^b. 17, 2 wußte E^a wuste E^b. 19, 10 geschwiegen E^a geschwigen E^b. 22, 4 erwecken E^a erweken E^b. 34, 14 erkundigen? E^a erkundigen: E^b erkundigen; E^c. 41, 4. 5 eine viereckige E^a rine viereckigte E^b. 44, 10 Ansehen E^a Ansehn E^b. 49, 6 Glaubigen . . . Unglaubigen E^a Gläubigen . . . Ungläubigen E^b. 86, 11 Fälle E^a *Drf.* Fallen E^b. 94, 4 das Zeichen E^a das Zeichen E^b. 95, 16 Initiirten E^a *Drf.* Initiirten E^b. 100, 14 allmählich E^a allmählig E^b. 133, 9 disponieren E^a disponiren E^b. 168, 12 einem E^b (*das m verkehrt*). 180, 13 mußten. Es E^a mußten, Es E^b *Drf.* 235, 6 diesesmal E^a dießmal E^b. 256, 17 verschaffte E^a verschafte E^b. 279, 7 glühte E^a glüthe E^b. 308, 15 werden E^a wetden E^b *Drf.* 344, 3 Arbrissell E^a Arbrissel E^b. 353, 8 verdießlicher E^a *Drf.* verdrüßlicher E^b. 357, 4 anging E^a angiong E^b. 361, 6 Rertz E^a Reiz E^b (*ähnlich* 368, 6; 371, 8). 386, 19 nicht E^a niche E^b *Drf.* 387, 5 angewandt E^a angewandi E^b *Drf.* 388, 9 bloß E^a blos E^b. 389, 20 besonnnen E^a *Drf.* 409, 17. 18 sanctioniert E^a sanctionirt E^b. Anstatt 275 hat E^a die Seitenzahl 257.

W. KURRELMAYER.

THE CASE OF THE PREDICATE COMPLEMENT AFTER REFLEXIVE VERBS IN OLD FRENCH

It has been rather generally accepted by Romance scholars that the correct usage after reflexive verbs in Old French is the nominative case for the predicate complement. When the oblique case has appeared, it has been explained either as the beginning of a breakdown in case, or as a grammatical error, apparently a remnant of the influence of Classical Latin. In a note to *Yvain*, 3020,¹ Foerster says, "—altiz. aber steht beim direkten Refl. das Präd. im Nom." The same explanation is to be found in the grammars of Diez and Meyer-Lübke.²

¹ *Yvain*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1912; Rom. Bibl. v).

In an effort to discover how frequently the oblique case is used instead of the nominative in early documents, as well as to find some reason for choice between the two forms, I have examined some twenty epics and romances as well as briefer forms. The texts studied make up in all nearly two hundred thousand lines of Old French. These poems are fairly representative of the language from its beginnings to the end of the 13th Century. A number of the texts—*Éulalie*, *Saint Léger*, *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, and *Éneïas* to be exact—yielded no material.

The examples which I have found are as follows:

Alexis:³ NOMINATIVE, il se fist si estranges (122, c); OBLIQUE, no examples.

Roland:⁴ NOM., Li emperere se fait et balz et liez (96), Mult se fait fiers (897), Plus se fait fiers (1111), s'en clament tuit dolent (1608), Tant se fait forz⁵ et fiers et maneviz (2125), s'en contienent plus queit (3555), se cuntienent plus queit (3797), si se claimet caitis (3817); OBL., Cil se feint mort (2275).

Couronnement de Louis:⁶ NOM., no examples; OBL., Li Sarrezins se sent navre (958), Tels se fait ore et orgoillos et fier (1512), Vers orgoillos se feseit molt très fier (1932).

Aliscans:⁷ NOM., no examples; OBL., Sovents fois se claine las dolent (720), Plus se fait fier (4581).

Mort Aymeri:⁸ NOM., se sent navrez el cors (1174), Et se clamerent chetif maleuré (1982), chetif se clament (2497); OBL., Et se clama chetif, maleuré (182), se senti abatu (1146).

Les Narbonnais:⁹ NOM., no examples; OBL., se clament chetis (7865).

³ F. Diez, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 1872, III, 120; W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, (Paris, 1900), III, 48, 49.

⁴ *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch*, ed. Foerster and Koschwitz (Leipzig, 1911).

⁵ *Das Altfranzösische Rolandslied*, ed. Stengel (Leipzig, 1900) I.

⁶ It is to be noted that the Oxford MS. reads *fort* instead of *forz*. This would make line 2125 an example of double usage.

⁷ *Le Couronnement de Louis*, ed. E. Langlois (Paris, 1888).

⁸ *Aliscans*, ed. Reinbach, Hartnacke, Rasch (Halle, 1903).

⁹ *La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne*, publié par J. Couraye du Parc (Paris, 1884).

¹⁰ *Les Narbonnais*, ed. H. Suchier (Paris, 1898).

Aiol.¹⁰ NOM., Marchegai se sant si delivres (1038), Aiols se tient tous cois (4328), Si se claime dolant, maleurés, caitis (5083), se tinrent mu et coi (7874), Teus se peut ore faire baus et joians et liés (8591); OBL., Ie me tieng chier (980), Si se claime dolant, maleurés, caitis (5083),¹¹ Li Lonbars . . . ains se fait mort (9011), De chou me renc coupable (9652).

Elie de Saint Gille.¹⁰ NOM., Mout se fait orgellous et hardis (366), Guillaumes d'Orange se senti desloïés (613), Por nule rien en tere ne se fesist se liés (614); OBL., no examples.

Alexandre le Grand.¹² NOM., s'en firent lié chevalier et sergant (150); OBL., li rois s'en fist joiant (149).

Roman d'Alexandre.¹³ NOM., se vif se laissent prendre (106, l. 15); OBL., caitif ne se claint (188, l. 22), li reis se sent blecié (401, l. 17), se fist signor clamer (489, l. 37).

Thèbes.¹⁴ NOM., Quant il se sentiront traï (3164); OBL., no examples.

Troie.¹⁵ NOM., A grant maniere se fait liez (:couchiez) (1769), Mout se claime chascuns dolenz (:denz) (3570), Ne se fist pas taisanz ne muz (:venuz) (3784), A tant se clamera chaitis (:ocis) (4903), Tant par se porreit faire liez (:desconseilliez) (6469), il s'en fait liez (:espleitiez) (22059), Mout se firent joiant e lié (:veilié) (27309); OBL., Bon conseiller se fait a lui (5781), E mout s'en fait Prianz irié (:deshaitié)—variant (634, line 12).

Philomena.¹⁶ NOM., Don Pandions mout liez se fist (8), Mout liez s'an fist? (9); OBL., no examples.

Erec.¹⁷ NOM., Tant se face orgueilleus ne cointes (:acointes) (3877); OBL., no examples.

Oligés.¹⁸ NOM., Qui chastes ne se viaut tenir (5326); OBL., se sant grevé (:esgené) (619).

¹⁰ *Aiol et Mirabel und Elie de Saint Gille*, ed. Foerster (Heilbronn, 1876-82).

¹¹ Note that in this line the verb is followed by both nominative and oblique cases in the predicate complement.

¹² *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen âge*, par Paul Meyer (Paris, 1886), I, 121.

¹³ *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, ed. H. Michelant (Stuttgart, 1846).

¹⁴ *Le Roman de Thèbes*, ed. L. Constans (Paris, 1890).

¹⁵ *Le Roman de Troie*, ed. L. Constans (Paris, 1904-12), 6 vol.

¹⁶ *Philomena*, ed. C. De Boer (Paris, 1909).

¹⁷ *Erec*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1909; *Rom. Bibl.*, XIII).

¹⁸ *Oligés*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1910; *Rom. Bibl.*, I).

Lancelot:¹⁹ NOM., Cil . . . qui dedanz anfermé se voient (2345), se tient Si coiz (4591-5); OBL., Mout s'an fet lié, mout s'an fet riche (:fiche) (1479), Si se fet las et traveillié (:beillié) (4565), Et quant cil se sant domagié (:tranchié) (7086).

Yvain:²⁰ NOM., Qu'il se santi navrez a mort (874), Mes nutz se voit (3020), Qui miauz s'ameroit morz que vis Sovant se clame las cheitis (4131-2); OBL., Ou vos vos clamez recreant (:creant) (5539), Ainz me clamasse recreant (:creant) (6281).

Perceval:²¹ NOM., chevaliers se fet (5235); OBL., se fust lors fere chevalier (4816).

Guillaume d'Angleterre:²² NOM., coi se tiennent (392), Don li anfes se fist mout liez (:viez) (1642); OBL., no examples.

La Vengeance Raguidel:²³ NOM., Qui(s) tient a faus plains de tosiue (1852), Qu'il se santi navrés a mort (5603), Fiers et hardis . . . S'ofre (5718); OBL., Gaberiés se sent feru (:escu) (3317).

Ille et Galeron:²⁴ NOM., Malades se sent (5195); OBL., Celui qui prison ne se rent (1163), Qui vif se laisse illoques prendre (2712).

Amadas et Ydoine:²⁵ NOM. and OBL., Mult se clame dolans, caitif (:estrif) (881).

Richars li Biaus:²⁶ NOM., Ains se tient cois (1913); OBL., Qu'il se tiegne fort (:effort) (2597), Quant li soudans se sent navre (:pre) (2836), Quant Richars l'ot mout s'en fait lie (:baisie) (3035), Richars . . . se fait lie (3684).

Roman de Rou:²⁷ NOM., no examples; OBL., Normanz se faiseient numer (129).

Guillaume de Palerne:²⁸ NOM. and OBL., se fier se face Si prox,

¹⁹ *Lancelot*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1889).

²⁰ *Yvain*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1912; *Rom. Bibl.* v).

²¹ *Perceval* [*Chrestien's von Troyes Contes del Graal* (Percevaus li galois)] ed. G. Baist, Freiburg i. Br. [1912]. Dale in *Rom. Bibl.* **xxi**, 225.

²² *Wilhelm von England*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1911; *Rom. Bibl.*, **xx**).

²³ *La Vengeance Raguidel*, ed. M. Friedwagner (Halle, 1909).

²⁴ *Ille und Galeron*, ed. Foerster (Halle, 1891, *Rom. Bibl.*, **vii**).

²⁵ *Amadas et Ydoine*, ed. C. Hippeau (Paris, 1863).

²⁶ *Richars Li Biaus*, ed. Foerster (Wien, 1874).

²⁷ *Le Roman de Rou*, ed. H. Andresen (Heilbronn, 1877-9) 2 vol.

²⁸ *Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. H. Michelant (Paris, 1876).

si cointe ne si os (2108-9); NOM., Plus se fait fiers que un lupart (6174); OBL., Ves com se fait conte et gaillart (:lupart) (6173).

It is evident from this study that the oblique case is more usual in the predicate complement of reflexive verbs in Old French than has been supposed. The two questions which interest the investigator in this matter are: first, how the nominative came to be the commoner form in this type of sentence; second, whether or not the oblique can be considered a legitimate alternative.

To the first question different explanations have been offered. In regard to *soi feire* Gaston Paris says²⁹ that this verb is equivalent to *fieri*, and "traité comme un verbe neutre ordinaire." This implies that the reflexives such as *soi tenir*, *soi veoir*, *soi sentir*, and *soi feire* may be considered equivalent to *estre*, and hence the nominative is expected in the predicate complement. Another explanation may be derived from Foerster's statement regarding constructions after verbs of naming—that is, that a vocative quality is evident in such complements—for which he gives the example *traître me claiment*. He says that the nominative here used is like that used with reflexive verbs.³⁰

Therefore, as justification for the nominative case after reflexive verbs, we may consider the equivalency of the reflexive verb to *estre*, or the complement as having a vocative quality, or we may examine such cases as the following: *Lancelot*, Se part mout esmaiez (3576); *Perceval*, S'an vint montez (5467); *Aiol*, Atant s'en retornerent couregous et iré (5145). In these examples there could be only one possible agreement of the participles; that is, they are modifiers of the subject, and hence in the nominative case. It is, then, reasonable to suppose that, as the nominative case is used with these verbs which have a reflexive pronoun and require the subject agreement, the nominative case should be used with other real reflexive verbs, such as *soi feire*, *soi veoir*, and where the adjective or participle is used as a complement.

More interesting than accounting for the nominative case as the usual form of the predicate complement is an inquiry concerning the frequent use of the oblique in the same construction. The acceptance of this form has been chiefly in connection with a single verb—*soi feire*. Mussafia considers the usage with this verb a

²⁹ *Extraits de la Chanson de Roland*, note 1, page 65.

³⁰ *Yvain*, Anmerkungen, 3619.

legitimate exception to the rule.³¹ Laubscher explains the use of the oblique as due to an early breakdown of cases. He says that when the oblique case is used, it is because the objective value after the verb is more strongly felt.³² The construction is, of course, in harmony with the Latin usage where the predicate complement takes the case of the object pronoun after reflexive verbs.

It seems doubtful if the usage is so exceptional as Mussafia would imply or if it is to be considered due to an early breakdown as Laubscher suggests. Rather it seems to be an early as well as a late, a fairly common, and a consciously accepted, alternative for the nominative usage. In documents of early enough date to distinguish the cases many examples show the oblique. Such sentences are not frequent enough to show it the preferred construction, but lead one to believe that the old writers had the sanction of usage for the oblique form and that its presence was not due to ignorance or to an error of the scribe.

The examples which have been cited show 35 oblique cases, 48 nominative cases, and 3 double constructions.³³ It is interesting to note that the 35 objectives are well scattered through the twenty odd texts considered. Some of the texts, it is true, show no examples of this form. These are: *Alexis*, *Philomena*, *Erec*, *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, and *Elie de Saint Gille*. On the other hand, there are four texts from which no examples of the nominative have been quoted—*Aliscans*, *Les Narbonnais*, *Le Couronnement de Louis*, and *Le Roman de Rou*. These two groups do not, as one might suppose, represent early and late tendencies respectively, but both contain works dating early and late in the period under discussion. Nor do they represent a particular section. Only a few Anglo-French texts have been used because they are likely to show earlier confusion of the cases than do Continental French texts.

The fact that the examples are taken from verse causes one to consider how far the exigencies of poetic devices may have influenced

³¹ *Z. R. Ph.*, III (1879), 251.

³² *The Syntactical Causes of Case Reduction in Old French*, Elliott Monographs, VII (Princeton-Paris, 1921), 65.

³³ These examples, already cited, of both nominative and oblique cases following the same verb form are: *Aiol* (5083), *Amadas* (881), *Guillaume de Palerne* (2108-9). There is a fourth instance in the *Oxford Roland* (2125).

the use of the oblique case. The fact that this case sometimes occurs as a rhyme sound shows that it was intentionally chosen and not a mistake of the scribe. But the fact that Old French is rich in rhyme sounds makes it seem unlikely that the poet felt himself forced to an incorrect use of this case when a slight change of the other rhyme sounds might have obviated the difficulty. It does not seem likely, then, that the use of the oblique case is very largely due to the poetic forms used by the authors of that time.

Is it not evident that the writers of Old French had no feeling that they were violating the rules of grammar when they used the oblique case for the complement following reflexive verbs? This supposition is particularly strengthened by the examples in which a single verb is followed by both cases in the same sentence. The conclusion seems to be that while the nominative is preferred, it is only a little more frequent, and that the oblique construction may be considered a legitimate alternative.

T. G. WESENBERG.

Butler University.

THE RULES OF CIVILITY (1671) AND ITS FRENCH SOURCE

One of the most popular manuals of courtesy in England of the Restoration was a small volume entitled, in its first edition (1671), *The Rules of Civility; or, Certain Ways of Deportment Observed in France; amongst All Persons of Quality, upon Several Occasions. Translated out of French.*¹ Edward Arber's *Term Catalogues* lists four editions of the work—1671, 1673 ("The Second Edition, with Additions"), 1678, and 1703²—and three reprints—one in 1675 and two in 1704.³ The British Museum and the London Library each have a copy of an edition dated 1685 which is not mentioned in the *Term Catalogues*.

Although *The Rules of Civility* (1671) is well known to be a

¹ London. . . . 1671. I have used the Library of Congress copy of this edition.

² I, 88; I, 138; I, 322; and III, 380, respectively.

³ I, 200; III, 393; and III, 417, respectively.

translation from the French, its exact source has apparently never been identified. It is evident from M. D. Conway's references in his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility*⁴ that he knew nothing of the date, title, or author of the French original. In a recent article entitled "French Etiquette in 1682,"⁵ Miss Daisy Stepney translates into English certain passages from an edition of the French original printed at Paris in 1682, but she makes no mention either of the English translation or of earlier editions of the French source; and she is probably in error concerning the authorship.⁶ The various bibliographers who notice the English translation make no reference to its source. It is, however, a translation of an anonymous work entitled *Nouveau traité de la civilité, qui se pratique en France parmi les honnêtes gens*, which made its first appearance at Paris in 1671 and which is attributed to Antoine de Courtin (1622-1685).⁷

⁴ London, 1890, p. 17.

⁵ *French Quarterly*, VIII (1926), 132-37.

⁶ She states that "The author signs only his initials—J. M." to the letter prefixed to the work, but Barbier remarks (*Dict. des ouvrages anonymes*, III, 1875, 521 b) that "J. Meusnier ne paroît avoir été que l'éditeur des divers traités d'Ant. de Courtin."

⁷ Since this work appeared in English, German, and Latin translations (see the copy of a polyglot edition in the Newberry Library at Chicago: *Nouveau traité de la civilité qui se pratique en France, parmi les honnêtes gens. Ein neu Tractatlein von der Höfflichkeit so in Franckreich under verständigen Leuthen im Gebrauch ist. Tractatus novus de civilitate usitata in Gallia, inter homines politos*. Basel, 1671) in the year 1671, Quérard is quite obviously wrong in asserting (*sub* "Courtin, Ant." in his *La France littéraire ou dictionnaire bibliographique*) that "La première édition parut en 1675." In his *Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* (III, 521 a) Barbier lists a first edition with the date 1671 and a second edition with the date 1672. The *Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la bibliothèque nationale* (XXXIII) records among others an eighth edition dated 1695 and other editions or reprints extending through the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Although all bibliographers who mention the book indicate that it is anonymous, they give no suggestion of their evidence for attributing it to Courtin. I have a copy, which was printed at Brussels without date (but since the printer, Simon T' Serstevens, according to the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, was printing books in 1724 and 1727, it is probably safe to assume a date ca. 1725), and whose title-page, giving the Abbé de Bellegarde as the author, reads as follows: "Traité de la civilité ou l'éducation parfaite, qui se pratique parmi les honnêtes gens. Par Mr. l'Abbé de Bellegarde. Dernière édition. A Brux-

For much of the material in his book Courtin probably drew upon a Jesuit manual entitled *Bienséance de la conversation entre les hommes*,⁸ which was published at Pont-à-Mousson in 1617 and at Rouen in 1618. This work was in turn based on Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo* (1558).⁹ The English *Rules of Civility* (1671) is therefore three removes from one of the fountain-heads of modern courtesy—the *Galateo* of della Casa.¹⁰

Aside from its literary relations, Courtin's treatise is of interest not merely because it contains a careful treatment of the principles of civility but because it describes concretely many of the social practices of the day that are not ordinarily dealt with

elles. Chez Simon T' Serstevens, Libraire proche les Peres Dominicains [n. d.]." If Courtin wrote the book, why have bibliographers failed to give evidence for his authorship? Or, assuming that they are correct in their attribution, did the Brussels printer, in his ignorance of the authorship of the anonymous work, attribute it to the Abbé de Bellegarde simply because Bellegarde was one of the most voluminous and most popular writers of courtesy literature in the later seventeenth century? Although the bibliographers give no evidence for the attribution to Courtin, it is probably safe to assume that since the book is nowhere mentioned among Bellegarde's works, the Brussels printer must have invented the authorship just as he altered the title.

⁸ I have been unable to secure a copy of the Jesuit manual for comparison with Courtin's work, but M. D. Conway, in his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility* (London, 1890), p. 17, points out that *The Rules of Civility*—the seventeenth century English translation of Courtin's work—"plagiarizes largely from the Jesuit manual."

⁹ For a brief description of the Jesuit manual and a discussion of its relation to the *Galateo*, see M. Magendie, *La politesse mondaine et les théories de l'honnêteté, en France, au XVII^e siècle, de 1600 à 1660* (2 vols., Paris [1925?]), I, 159 ff.

¹⁰ The dangers which often attend an attempt to trace a work of courtesy to its source before one knows its whole family tree are shown by M. D. Conway's researches in connection with George Washington's *Rules of Civility*. Conway satisfied himself (see pp. 12 ff. of his Introduction to the *op. cit.*) that by the help of a French schoolmaster, Washington had taken his rules directly from the Jesuit manual referred to above. Charles Moore (see the Introduction to his edition of *George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation*. Boston and New York, 1926) has given positive proof, however, that Washington's immediate source was not the Jesuit manual but an English version of it entitled *Youth's Behaviour* made by Francis Hawkins and first published in London in 1641.

in courtesy books of the period. A few of the more interesting passages, which are as suggestive as informing, will serve to illustrate this feature. "Pour commencer par la porte de la maison d'un Prince, ou d'un grand Seigneur," says Courbin, "c'est incivilité de heurter fort, & plus d'un coup. A la porte des Chambres ou du Cabinet, c'est bestise & manque de respect, de heurter; il faut grater" (pp. 36-7).¹¹

Il n'est aussi nullement de la politesse, de se promener dans l'antichambre en attendant: cela même est défendu chez le Roy; & si on le fait, les Huissiers vous font repimende, ou vous font sortir.

Il n'est pas de la bienséance non plus, de chanter ou de siffler en attendant, comme l'on dit, pour se desennuyer: Ce qu'il faut aussi se garder de faire dans les rues, ou autres lieux où il y a concours de monde (p. 45).

Il y en a même qui ayant appris le raffinement de la civilité dans quelque pais étranger n'osent ni se couvrir, ni s'asseoir le dos tourné au portrait de quelque personne de qualité eminente (p. 40).

Il ne faut point prendre de tabac en poudre, si la personne qualifiée qui est en droit d'en prendre devant nous, ne nous en presentoit familièrement; au quel cas il faut en prendre, ou en faire le semblant, si on y avoit repugnance (p. 91).

Que si elle [la personne] étoit, il ne faut pas luy dire tout haut, *Dieu vous assiste*: mais il faut seulement se découvrir, & faire une profonde reverence, faisant ce souhait interieurement (p. 97).

In a long chapter on conduct at the table the writer tells us that all guests stand "quand on dit *Benedicite* & Grace . . . & en ce (*sic*) placant avoir la teste nuë, & ne se couvrir qu'après que l'on est tout à fait assis, & que les personnes plus qualifiées sont couvertes" (p. 114). In going out of one's house to greet a visitor, "Il faut avoir alors où son épée au costé, ou son manteau sur les épaules: ou si l'on est d'épée, & que l'on soit en manteau, il faut avoir le manteau & l'épée, estant indécent de paroistre autrement" (p. 183). If upon his arrival, however, the visitor should find one in bed, "il faut y demeurer" (p. 183). If one is hunting with an eminent person ("une personne qualifiée"), "il ne faut pas la couper, ni se laisser emporter par trop d'ardeur: mais il faut la laisser arriver la première à la prise & à la mort de la beste: Et s'il faut mettre l'épée à la main, ou le pistolet pour luy donner le dernier coup, il faut laisser cet honneur à la

¹¹ This and the following passages are quoted from the polyglot edition referred to above.

personne qualifiée" (pp. 212-13). The author gives much advice on letter-writing:

Il est à remarquer pour la ceremonie de l'écriture, qu'il est plus respectueux de se servir de grand papier, que de petit; & que le papier sur lequel on écrit doit estre double, & non en simple demi-feuille, quand on n'écrirait à la premiere page que six lignes. Qu'après le *Monseigneur* ou le *Monsieur* que l'on met au commencement d'une lettre, on laisse beaucoup de blanc avant que d'écrire le corps de la lettre, differemment pourtant, selon la qualité des personnes (pp. 217-18).

Il est bon aussi de scavoir, que pour plus de respect on met la lettre dans une enveloppe sur laquelle on met le dessus: Et pour les Dames, on cachette les lettres avec de la soye en mettant le dessus sur la lettre même; ce qui s'observe à l'égard des Dames de la plus grande qualité, si ce n'est que pour marque d'un plus grand respect, on peut mettre la lettre déjà cachettée de soye, dans une enveloppe, sur laquelle on met encore le dessus (pp. 225-6).

From a comparison of a copy of the first edition of *The Rules of Civility* (1671) with the French of the polyglot edition referred to above (which, since it was printed before the appearance of the second edition of the original, must have been a reprint of the first edition), it is evident that the English translator (or translators) has followed his original rather closely. Although he not infrequently paraphrases passages in the earlier chapters on the theory of civility, he is careful to give a close, almost literal, rendering of the rules themselves. The only striking variation I have discovered in his translation occurs in Chapter VII, which treats of the gentleman's conduct at church. Here the English version contains certain references to church ceremonies which do not appear in the Basel polyglot version. The Brussels edition *ca.* 1725) of Courtin's work referred to above has, however, several rules relating to Roman Catholic ceremony which do not appear in the English translation. A collation of the three versions leads one to conclude that whereas the Basel printer omitted all passages relating to church ceremonies, the English translator omitted only such passages as applied to the Roman Catholic ceremony rather than to that of the Church of England.

Not only does the English translator follow his original closely, but he is evidently careful to keep abreast of the various changes made in later editions of the original. The very titles of his several editions indicate that he kept in close touch with the suc-

cessive editions of the French original and took advantage of the various enlargements of the latter work to bring out new editions in English. Thus in the *Term Catalogues* for 6 May, 1673 (I, 138), is listed "The Second Edition, with Additions"; under date of 22 June, 1678 (I, 322), another edition is described as "Newly revised, and very much enlarged, according to a new Edition lately Printed in *France*"; and in December, 1703 (III, 380), is mentioned still another edition as "Newly done out of the Twelfth Edition in French." This edition is twice listed under "Reprints."

The fact that a number of enlarged editions of the French tract were published in English over a period of more than thirty years is, I think, significant of the demand during the period for French works of courtesy; and the care of the translator (or translators) to give a close rendering of the French and his readiness to incorporate into a new English edition enlargements made in the French original may possibly be regarded as additional evidence of the admiration Englishmen of the later seventeenth century had for French manners and social standards.

VIRGIL B. HELTZEL

Northwestern University.

THE DATE OF *THE NOBLE GENTLEMAN*

The recorded stage history of *The Noble Gentleman* begins on February 3, 1626, on which date it was licensed as by John Fletcher. Twenty-one years later it appeared in the first folio of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays, preceded by a prologue which implies that the play is the work of both Beaumont and Fletcher and states that it was popular "twenty years agoe."¹ Only two efforts have been made to date the play. Oliphant, thinking he recognized in it the hand of Beaumont, dated it "about 1607," but added in a footnote:

¹ The evidence of this prologue is, of course, of no value. It has been noted that the same prologue was prefixed to the 1649 quarto of *Thierry and Theodoret*.

That the play has not come down to us in its original form is abundantly evident, but whether the alterations were made by Massinger (? and W. Rowley) in '25-26 on the original work of B. and F., or by F. (? about '12 or '16) on the original work of B., I cannot say.²

Weber, judging doubtless by the date of the license that the play was never acted until after Fletcher's death, conjectured that "being left imperfect by that poet, some of his friends finished it, perhaps Shirley."³ Dyce and Fleay, though they would substitute others instead of Shirley as the redactor, have accepted Weber's suggestion that the play was left unfinished by Fletcher.⁴

It is, of course, quite impossible to prove either of these views erroneous. I believe, however, that I shall demonstrate that *The Noble Gentleman* either was originally composed or was revised in late 1621 or early 1622. If Fletcher was the original author and if he was at that time working on the play, does it not contradict all we know of Fletcher to assume that he would for three or four years leave the play in its unfinished state? Would not Fletcher, if he were for any reason unable to complete the play, have turned it over to one or more of his many assistants?

That the play was being composed or revised between 1619 and 1622 is, I think, shown by a speech by Clerimont in Act I, scene i. Monsieur Marine is urging his cousin to send his wife to court, and Clerimont replies:

Sir, I had rather send her to *Virginia*
To help to propagate the *English* Nation.

This reply is, I think, clearly a reference to an organized movement to transport women to the colony. Before 1626, when the play was licensed, only one such movement is recorded. The records of the Virginia Company show that this movement was not thought

² *Englische Studien*, xv (1891), 340 n. Since 1891 Mr. Oliphant has devoted much study to the Beaumont and Fletcher plays. I believe he hopes shortly to publish his present views, which probably differ in many respects from those expressed in 1891.

³ Quoted by Dyce, *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, Boston, 1854, II, 677.

⁴ Bullen (*D.N.B.*) and Macaulay (*Camb. Hist.*, vi, 158), who do not recognize the hand of Fletcher in the play, offer no suggestions as to the date. Thorndike dates it "1625?"

of until late 1619 and that it was completed two years later. I quote at length from the records of the Company so that the reader may see how exactly the purpose of the Company corresponded to that expressed by Clerimont -- "to propagate the *English Nation*" --, may judge how much publicity such a movement would receive and how a reference to it might provoke laughter, and may understand more fully my reasons for believing that the play was originally composed or was revised in 1621 or 1622.

The advisability of transporting women to the colony was first suggested to the Company on November 3, 1619:

As in the last Court Mr Deputy acquainted them of mr Threasurer so he being now present it pleased him to relate, that although to the time giuen him by the Companies orders he had bene absent yet he hath not bene idle to Virginia, as he will giue Accompt of: And therefore he had to offer to their consideracion a Proposition for the inlarging of the Plantation in the publike. And first touching the Publike, he shewed how farr the Company had already proceeded. First in Ianuary last there went fifty men with Sr George Yeardly to be Tenants of the Gouernors land, whereof there failed by the way two or three, and six were now remayning to him of Capt Argolls garde. Afterward in Aprill next twenty men should haue bene sent by Xofer Lawne vnto the Common Land, but he deliuered but 15 because the Company performed not wth him, touching the Loane of Corne and Cattle as he expected: Then 4 more were sent in the Triall according to the direccion of his Matie. And in the begining of August Last, one hundreth more--50--to the Colledge Land and 50 to the Common: And for one hundreth persons or thereabout wch appeareth to haue bene sent in these 2 or 3 last yeares at the Companies charges, Sr Geo: Yeardley writeth of but three to be found remayning for the Company; So that there is by this Account vpon the Common Land 72 persons, 53 on the Gouernors, and 50 on the Colledges: 175 in the whole. Therefore he proposed now to be considered of against the Quarter Court this fortnight that there be sent the next spring 130 men more, wch will make those already sent for the Gouernor Colledge, and Common Land the full number of Three hundred, . . .

. . . He also thought it fitt to send 100 more to be Prentizes or Servants that the rest may goe on more cheerefully, wherein he hoped the city would deale as worthily as heretofore. Lastly he wished that a fitt hundreth might be sent of woemen, Maids young and vncorrupt to make wives to the Inhabitants and by that meanes to make the men there more settled & lesse moueable who by defect thereof (as is credibly reported) stay there but to gett something and then to returne for England, wch will breed a dissolucion, and so an ouerthrow of the Plantacion. These woemen if they marry to the

Publique ffarmors, to be transported at the charges of the Company; If otherwise, then those that takes them to wife to pay the said Company their charges of transportation, and it was neuer fitter time to send them then nowe.⁵

The Records show that the proposition was accordingly brought before the Quarter Court a fortnight later:

. . . And because he vnderstood that the people thither transported, though seated there in their persons for some fewe yeares, are not settled in their mindes to make it their place of rest and continuance, but having gotten some wealth there, to returne againe into England: ffor the remedyng of that mischiefe, and establishing of a perpetuities to the Plantation, he aduised and made it his Third Proposicion, to send them ouer One hundreth young Maides to become wives; that wives, children and familie might make them lesse moueable and settle them, together with their Iosteritie in that Soile.⁶

There was, however, considerable delay in completing the arrangements for sending the women to Virginia. Twenty months later none had been sent, for it was not until the meeting of July 16, 1621, that the Company made plans for financing their transportation. The records of the Company under that date show that

flower seueral Roll were now read and offered to such as would please to vnderwrite The first being for a Magazine of Apparrell, and other necessary provisions such as the Colony stood in great need of; The Second for sendinge of 100: mayds to be made wives; . . .⁷

Although this delay in transporting the women may have been in part due to the unwillingness of those selected—as was the delay in sending the one hundred apprentices or servants—, such unwillingness, I believe, can hardly explain a delay of two years. Two months after it had been first suggested that one hundred prentices and one hundred maids be sent to the colony, the one hundred prentices had been selected and the Company had petitioned the government for special authority to use force upon

⁵ *The Records of the Virginia Company of London*, edited by Susan Myra Kingsbury. 2 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906, I, 255-257.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 269.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 514.

those unwilling to leave England.⁸ Two years, however, have passed before we learn that any women had been sent. In July 1621, as seen from the record quoted above, plans were made for financing their transportation, and at the meeting of November 21, 1621, it is noted that sixty maids had been sent.

The Third Roll was for sendinge of Mayds to Virginia to be made Wyues, wch the Planters there did verie much desire by the want of whome haue sprange the greatest hinderances of the encrease of the Plantacion, in that most of them esteeming Virginia not as a place of Habitation but onely of a short sojourninge haue applyed themselves and their labors wholly to the raisinge of present proffitt and vterly neglected not only staple Commodities but euen the verie necessities of mans life, in regard whereof and to preuent so great an inconvenience hereafter whereby the Planters minds may be the faster tyed to Virginia by the bonds of Wyues and Children, care hath bin taken to provide them younge handsome and honestly educated maids whereof 60 are already sent to Virginia being such as were specially recomended vnto the Companie for their good bringinge vp by their parents or friends of good worth: wch mayds are to be disposed in marriage to the most honest and industrious Planters who are to defraye and satisfie to the Aduenturors the charges of their passages and prouisions at such rats as they and the Aduenturors Agents there shall agree and in case any of them faile through mortality it is ordered that a proporcionable addicion shalbe made vpon the rest, In the furtherance of wch Christian Accion diuers of the said Aduenturors had vnderwritt diuers good sommes of money none vnder 8li wherely the whole Some of that Roll did already amount to 800li as may appeare by the subscriptions.⁹

As I have said, this was the only organized effort to send women to Virginia during the life of the Virginia Company. The Company, of course, passed out of existence in 1624, a little more than a year before *The Noble Gentleman* was licensed; but during the interim there is no reference in the *Calendar of State Papers (Colonial)* which suggests another shipment of women. The crown, under which the colony passed upon the dissolution of the Company, was indeed notoriously uninterested in the welfare of the colonies and much less active than the Company had been in their development.

⁸ See the letter of Sir E. Sandys to Secretary Robert Naunton asking for such special authority. *Domestic Corresp. Jac. I.*, Vol. CXIX., No. 49, Cal. p. 118. (*Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, Jan. 28, 1620.)

⁹ *Op cit.*, I, 566.

If I am correct in thinking that Clerimont refers to the publicity accompanying an organized movement to transport women to Virginia, the reference must, in order to have furnished any amusement, have been written between December 1619 and early 1622. Because of the long delay in shipping the women and because the plans for financing their transportation were not completed until the middle of 1621, I am inclined to believe that the Company did not give publicity to their efforts to secure women prior to the beginning of the year 1621. The reference in the play indicates, I think, a date very close to the actual shipping of the maids.

Possibly there is confirmatory evidence for dating the play 1621-22 in the use of the name Shattillion for the "Lord mad for Love," who imagines the king suspects him of plotting for the throne. Ordinarily there would, of course, be no necessity for an explanation of the choice of this name; the family of Chatillon had for centuries been prominent in French history and closely connected with the royal family. However, as other evidence indicates that the play was being worked on in 1621-1622, it seems possible—to me even probable—that the name Shattillion was suggested by the appearance in 1621 of André du Chesne's *Histoire généalogique de la maison de Chastillon-sur-Marne*. If the name of the mad lord was suggested by the publication of this history, *The Noble Gentleman* must, I think, have been composed rather than revised in 1621-1622.¹⁰

BALDWIN MAXWELL.

University of Iowa.

¹⁰ Unfortunately I have not been able to consult du Chesne's *Histoire*. Possibly the author (or authors) of *The Noble Gentleman* made use of du Chesne, although the close resemblance of the Shattillion plot to the story of the Passionate Madman in *Nice Valour* makes me think it unlikely that the *Histoire* could have been the source of any of the incidents in the play.

A NOTE ON *EASTWARD HO*, I, ii, 178

In the second scene of the first act of *Eastward Ho*, Touchstone asks Golding, "How dost thou like the knight, Sir Flash? does he not looke bigge? howe likst thou the elephant? he sayes he has a castle in the countrey." And Golding replies, "Pray heaven, the elephant carry not his castle on his backe."

Commenting on this passage in his notes to the Belles-Lettres edition of this play, Professor Schelling remarks, "Gallants often impoverished their estates by the costliness of their garments"; and while this meaning was doubtless implicit in Golding's line, a supplementary foot-note referring to the "elephant and castle" might have been made when Professor Schelling reprinted the play in his *Typical Elizabethan Plays* (1926). For Golding's line elicited a commendation from Touchstone—"Fore heaven, very well!"—which shows that a double meaning was here understood.

To the Elizabethan public, the elephant and castle was a well-known pageant.¹ In the Duke of Newcastle's *Country Captain* (1649) is a reference to it: "Thou fence before the Pageants & make roome for the porters, when like Elephants they carry once a yeare the Cyttie Castles" (Cf. *English Pageantry*, I, p. 67, n. 1 [on p. 68]). The elephant, in the Middle Ages, was nearly always represented with a castle on his back (Larwood and Hutton, *History of Signboards*, p. 155, cited in *Eng. Pag.*, I, p. 68, n. 1); the device is on the seal of Coventry, and was commonly used by the cutlers as a sign, it being the crest of the Cutlers' Company, on account of the ivory used in their trade. References to this arm of the Indian forces are found in mediæval romances, whence the figure may have come into pageantry direct, or through trade; and from pageantry, it became a popular inn-sign, as did the Green Man. (Cf. the references from *Marlin Chuzzlewit*, cited in *Eng. Pag.*, I, p. 69 and n. 1). It was, at one time, the form of the "castle" in chess; and to the references in *English Pageantry* may be added this passage from *Vanity Fair* (Ch. xxxviii): "He ordered and sent . . . a

¹ In Professor Parrott's edition of the comedies of Chapman (1913) which includes this play (see the notes, under I, ii, 147-8), he observes that the elephant was constantly depicted with a castle on his back, but gives no reason for this.

grand ivory set of chessmen from China. The pawns were little green and white 'men, with real swords and shields; the knights were on horseback; the castles were on the backs of elephants." ² Perhaps the intricacies of the elephant were too much for European carvers; at any rate, it is worth noting that in more modern Occidental sets of chessmen the castle is the only piece who might not be supposed to be alive. Dickens was doubtless thinking of the inn-sign in the passages from *Martin Chuzzlewit* alluded to above; and it was an inn which gave the name Elephant and Castle to a district of London.

Golding undoubtedly referred to this popular piece of pageantry when he made his remark, as well as to the indigence of "Sir Flash." Later on (Act II, sc. iii) Sir Petronel admits to Quicksilver that he has no castle: "O, Frank, my castle! Alas, all the castles I have are built with air, thou knowest!" and Touchstone (Act IV, sc. ii) desires his daughter, Lady Flash, to "return in quest of your bright and most transparent castle." She laments (Act V, sc. i) that "all my knight's living lies i' the Counter. . . . There's his castle now!" In the epilogue is a reference to the Lord Mayor's Show. Quicksilver says: ". . . See, if the streets and the fronts of the houses be not stuck with people, and the windows filled with ladies, as on the solemn day of the Pageant!"

O may you find in this our pageant here,
The same contentment which you came to seek;
And as that show but draws you once a year,
May this attract you hither once a week.

From Peele's Lord Mayor's Show of 1585 to the closing of the theatres, several well-known dramatists had a hand in planning these civic spectacles.

ROBERT WITHINGTON.

Smith College.

² Cf. *Dombey and Son*, ch. xii: "Paul's chair was next to Miss Blimber; but it being found, when he sat in it, that his eyebrows were not much above the level of the tablecloth, some books were brought in from the Doctor's study, on which he was elevated, and on which he always sat from that time—carrying them in and out himself on after occasions, like a little elephant and castle."

GLEANINGS OF CHURCHILL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mr. Joseph M. Beatty's recent article, "Churchill's Influence on Minor Eighteenth Century Satirists,"¹ opens an interesting subject. The present paper merely adds a few notes to the extensive bibliography published by Mr. Beatty.

Identification of the authors of anonymous pamphlets is not always easy. But a few of the satires listed by Mr. Beatty as anonymous may be associated with particular poets or poetasters upon fairly reliable evidence. The *Anti-Rosciad* (1761) has been attributed to Thomas Morell.² The *Meretriciad* (1761), which Mr. Fuess ascribes to Arthur Murphy and Mr. Beatty ascribes to "R. Thompson," is regularly placed to the credit, or discredit, of Edward Thompson.³ The *Conciliad* (1761), which reached a fourth edition in 1762, is sometimes attributed to W. Samson. The *Four Farthing Candles* (1762) was written by Cuthbert Shaw.⁴ *Churchill Defended* (1765) was probably written by Percival Stockdale,⁵ to whom, likewise, *Patriotism* (1765) has been somewhat dubiously attributed. The *Laureat* (1765) is the work of Edward Burnaby Greene, who also wrote *Poetical Essays* (1772).⁶ *Characters* (1766) is almost certainly the work of Francis Gentleman.⁷ *The Powers of the Pen* (1766) was written by the Rev. Evan Lloyd.⁸ *The Hobby Horse* (1766) is regularly ascribed to John Potter.⁹

May not *The Hamiltoniad* (Philadelphia, 1804), which is doubtfully attributed to J. R. Hopkins, be identical with *The Hamiltoniad* (Boston, 1804) that was reprinted by the Hamilton Club in New York in 1866? If so, it was the work of John Williams,

¹ *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XLII, 1927, 162-176.

² Fuess, C. M., *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse* (New York, 1912), 19.

³ See the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁴ Also *D. N. B.*, account of Shaw by Thomas Seecombe.

⁵ Stonehill, Block, and Stonehill, *Anonyma and Pseudonyma* (London, 1926).

⁶ *D. N. B.*, article by Gordon Goodwin.

⁷ *D. N. B.*, article by Joseph Knight.

⁸ *D. N. B.*, article by Thomas Seecombe.

⁹ *D. N. B.*, account of John Potter (fl. 1759-1804) by Gerald Le Grys Norgate.

the notorious "Anthony Pasquin" at whom William Gifford aimed a casual stroke in his *Epistle to Peter Pindar* (1800).

There is evidence in favor of slight changes in some of the data in Mr. Beatty's list. The author of *The Authors* (1766) was apparently Hayes rather than Haynes. The first edition of *The Race* was published in 1765. The first part of Kelly's *Thespis* was issued in 1766. *A Parody on the Rosciad of Churchill* was noticed by the *Monthly Review* in 1781, but was issued in 1780.¹⁰ On the other hand, Mr. Beatty was apparently quite right in dating *The Meretriciad* 1761 in spite of the fact that J. K. Laughton in the article on Edward Thompson in the *Dictionary of National Biography* asserts that *The Meretriciad* was published in 1755.

The following titles supplement Mr. Beatty's extensive list of works that show the influence of Churchill:

The Triumvirate: A poetical Portrait. Taken from the Life, and finished after the Manner of Swift. By Veritas, an unknown Hand. (London, 1761.)¹¹

(Pye, Henry J. ?) *The Apology, Addressed to the Reviewers, By ———, Esq., Author of The Rosciad of Covent Garden.* (London, 1762.)¹²

(Thompson, E.) *The Courtesan.* By the Author of the *Meretriciad.* (London, 1765.)¹³

Verses occasioned by the Death of the Rev. Mr. Churchill. (Edinburgh, [1764 or 1765].)¹⁴

Roscius: or, A critical Examination into the Merits of all the principal Performers belonging to the Norwich Theatre. For last Season. (London, 1767.)

Churchill, W. *The Temple of Corruption. A Poem.* (London, 1770.)¹⁵
An Essay on Woman; a Poem. (London, 1772.)¹⁶

¹⁰ See the copy in the Wrenn Library at the University of Texas.

¹¹ The Triumvirs were Churchill, Coleman, and Lloyd. This amusing skit, a copy of which is to be seen in the Wrenn Library at the University of Texas, belongs in the series with Murphy's *Ode to the Naiads of Fleet Ditch.*

¹² *Monthly Review*, xxvi, 473.

¹³ The author boasts acquaintance with Churchill.

¹⁴ A sixpenny pamphlet noted in the *Scots Magazine* for January, 1765 (xxvii, 39).

¹⁵ The author is said, in an advertisement, to be a brother of Charles Churchill. D. N. B. gives no information about a brother whose initial was W.

¹⁶ Sometimes attributed to "Rev. S. Johnson," this attack on Wilkes was noticed in the *Monthly Review* (xlvi, 410) as comparable in style to

The Resurrection of Liberty, or Advice to the Colonists, a Poem. By the Ghost of Churchill. (London, 1774.)¹⁷

The Stage of Aristophanes (London, 1774.)¹⁸

Theatrical Portraits (Epigrammatically delineated, wherein the merits and demerits of most of our stage heroes and heroines are excellently painted by some of our best masters.) (London, 1774.)¹⁹

The Drama; a Poem (London, 1775.)

(Pratt, Samuel Jackson.) *Garrick's Looking-glass; or The Art of Rising on the Stage. A Poem, in three Cantos, Decorated with dramatic Characters. By the Author of ———.* (London, 1776.)

Mr. Beatty concludes his study at the year 1783, asserting that in that year the influence of Churchill was rapidly waning. But he includes in his list a few titles of later publications, and to these the following may be added:

"Anthony Pasquin" (Williams, John). *The Children of Thespis; a Poem. Part I.* (London, 1786.)

As You Like It. A Poem addressed to a Friend (London, 1785.)²⁰

The Garrickiad, a Poem; being a Companion to the Rosciad of Churchill. By a Gentleman. (London, 1787.)

The New Rosciad. [London, 1787?]²¹

(Williams, John.) *The Children of Thespis. Parts II and III.* (London, 1788.)

The Modern Stage Exemplified, in an Epistle to a Young Actor, Part I. (London, 1788.)²²

A Trip to Parnassus; or, The Judgment of Apollo on Dramatic Authors and Performers. A Poem. (London, 1788.)²³

some of the works of Churchill. The title of the piece tempts one to a bibliographical digression concerning the scandalous *Essay on Woman* (1763) written by Thomas Potter and privately printed for Wilkes, to whom it was generally ascribed. It was the subject of a violent pamphlet war and the object of several more or less scurrilous imitations.

¹⁷ *Gentleman's Magazine*, XLIV, 533.

¹⁸ "An account of the summer-actors at Foote's theatre in the Haymarket," this piece is noticed in the *Monthly Review*, LI, 483.

¹⁹ The reviewer (*Monthly Review*, LI, 353-354) compares this "list of actors" to the *Rosciad* but says it is "not very severe or smart."

²⁰ In the *Monthly Review*, LXIII, 72, this poem is said to be "full of Churchill's rage."

²¹ This title appears in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LVII, 524. The poem may be identical with that issued under the same title in 1785.

²² Called a "pseudo-Rosciad" by a reviewer for the *European Magazine*, XIV, 114-115.

²³ This piece was written by a woman, and may have more of the "Ses-

Liverpool Odes, or Affectionate Epistles for the Year 1793. By Junius Churchill, Esq.²⁴

"The Stage" in *Verses on Various Occasions.* (London, 1795.)

The Druriad; or, Strictures on the principal Performers of Drury-lane Theatre. A Satirical Poem; with Notes Critical and Explanatory. (London, 1798.)

Burton, W. *A Pasquinade on the Performers of the York Company.* By W. Burton, Comedian. (Leeds, 1801.)

The Young Rosciad, an admonitory Poem, well seasoned with Attic Salt, cum notis variorum. By Peter Panglos, Esq., LL D. and A. S. S. (London, 1805.)

Mr. Beatty is of the opinion that in 1783 "Churchill's posthumous influence upon the minor controversial writers . . . was rapidly waning" and "sustained satire in verse was giving way to the pamphlet and to short satirical songs."²⁵ It is quite true that the fashions in satire change. In the decade after Churchill's death the light, anapestic verses of Christopher Anstey found many imitators. In the second decade, the *Heroic Epistles* of William Mason exerted a strong influence. In the third decade, there were many odes upon the model of Peter Pindar's pleasantries.²⁶ In the last five years of the century, Gifford and Mathias were largely

sion of Poets" than of the *Rosciad* in its composition. It is noticed in the *Monthly Review*, LXXVIII, 241.

²⁴ *British Critic*, III, 85.

²⁵ *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XLII, 170 and 171. On page 162, Mr. Beatty remarks that "sustained satire persisted until about 1775, when it gradually gave place to the satirical ballad, the ode, and the pamphlet." As a matter of fact, probably as many satires in verse were separately published in English in 1778 as in any other year after the flurry that immediately followed the death of Pope. At least fifty were published in 1788, and while most of that number were in the form of Petro-Pindaric odes, there were among them pieces with such heroic titles as *The Controversiad*, *The Lousiad*, *The Odiad*, and *The Patriad*.

²⁶ An amusing illustration of the mixture of influences is to be found in "Matthew Bramble's" *Odes to Actors*, the matter of a Rosciad in a style compounded of Peter Pindar and watergruel. The odes are reprinted in the first sixty pages of *The Miscellaneous Works of A. M'Donald; including the Tragedy of Vimonda, and those publications which have appeared under the signature of Matthew Brambles, Esq., with various other compositions by the same author.* (London, 1791.) On page 49, "Bramble" hails Woods as "Caledonia's Roscius."

responsible for the new vogue of the Juvenalian satire in heroic couplets. But surely the titles listed above indicate that to the very end of the century the influence of Churchill persisted.

ROBERT C. WHITFORD.

Knox College

THE SOURCE OF A NOTE IN JOHNSON'S EDITION OF *MACBETH*

In *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare: One Aspect*¹ Professor Karl Young notes that in several cases Johnson shows some indebtedness to Charlotte Lennox's *Shakespeare Illustrated*. This book, in which Mrs. Lennox presents the sources for fourteen of Shakespeare's plays and compares eight of the history plays with their sources, Professor Young conjectures she undertook at the suggestion of Johnson, who wished to save himself the laborious study of sources which he had promised in his proposals. Professor Young points out that Johnson mentions Mrs. Lennox's book only three times in his edition of Shakespeare, although he has several times used the information she contributed without mentioning her name. I should like to call attention to another case where Johnson seems, at least indirectly, to be indebted to Mrs. Lennox for a note in his edition of Shakespeare.

On the first day of March, 1760, was published the first number of *The Lady's Museum* by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox. It continued to appear through eleven numbers, the last one advertised for February 3, 1761. This periodical is very scarce, the Yale Library having the only known copy complete in two volumes, although the library of the University of Chicago has volume II. The magazine is not included in the Crane-Kaye *Census of British Periodicals and Newspapers 1620-1800*. In volume I, pp. 409-11 of *The Lady's Museum*, there is printed a contribution signed C. D., concerning that much-discussed passage in *Macbeth*, Macduff's line in the last act, "He has no children." Part of this letter I will reprint here.

¹ *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, 1924, No. 18, 147-227.

. . . The expression, He has no children, is supposed and understood to refer to Macbeth, who having no children, could not afford to Macduff an adequate revenge. The supposition undoubtedly is natural . . . but the fact is not true. Macbeth had a son, his name was Luthlac. After the death of his father he was extremely troublesome to Malcolm he claimed the crown; and though a very weak deficient man, he answered the intentions of a rebellious party. . . . In less than three months the usurper Luthlac was slain by Malcolm: then, and not till then, ended the race of Macbeth.

From hence it evidently appears that the sentence, *He has no children*, cannot refer to Macbeth. At whom then is it pointed? At Malcolm. The heart-struck Macduff heard with patience the consolatory advice administered by his royal master; but well knew, and could not avoid expressing to himself, that as Malcolm had no children he could little judge of that torrent of grief with which Macduff must naturally be overwhelmed, at the loss of his wife, and *all his pretty ones*.

Malcolm was not married; he could not feel the throbs of a parent's heart, or the anguish of an husband's love. To him the sweet and inexpressible sensations of nuptial happiness were unknown: he was ignorant of the decent pride, the rising hopes, the alluring prospects that occupy, and swell alternately a father's breast. . . .

In this view, I think, Shakespeare displays his own character, and reveals his own sentiments as a parent. If the sentence had referred solely to Macbeth (supposing he had no children) it carries with it rage, fury, and revenge? If to Malcolm, it is the reflection of a wise, considerate man, who is thankful to his friend for his advice, but conscious that that advice is, for the present, to no purpose.

In his edition of Shakespeare (1765), five years after this letter was printed in *The Lady's Museum*, Johnson has this note on the passage:

He has no children—It has been observed by an anonymous critick, that this is not said of Macbeth, who had children, but of Malcolm, who having none, supposes a father can be so easily comforted.

This seems a neat summary of C. D.'s letter. If Johnson did not read "Charlotte's book" himself, it is probable that Mrs. Lennox called to his attention this Shakespearean note from her publication.

MIRIAM R. SMALL.

Wells College.

THE FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATOR OF *WERTHER*

On the death of Daniel Malthus, the father of the economist, an obituary notice in the *Monthly Magazine* for February, 1800, attributed to him English translations of *Werther*, *Paul et Virginie*, and a treatise on landscape by d'Ermenonville, all published by James Dodsley.¹ Thomas Robert Malthus immediately denied these ascriptions,² but later writers on the fortunes of *Werther* in England have usually accepted Daniel Malthus as the translator of the 1779 *Sorrows of Werter*.³ Carré has recently written of this version as William Render's ' ; this error is corrected in some valuable notes on Carré's *Werther* section by Arthur E. Turner, who goes on to say that the translation of 1779 is either by Daniel Malthus " or, as appears to me more likely, by Rev. Richard Graves, tutor of T. R. Malthus." ⁵ Lack of space doubtless prevented further discussion of the point.

It now appears beyond peradventure that the 1779 version was from the pen of Graves. The 911th Caxton Head Catalogue⁶ records his autograph receipt for £40 paid by James Dodsley for the copyright of *The Sorrows of Werter*, 20 June, 1780. Dodsley has added a note: "Mr. Graves afterwards recd. as much more as made it 200£." As Turner implies, the association of Graves and the Malthus family probably lies behind the mistaken attribution in the *Monthly Magazine*. Although Graves was known for a novelist himself, and held unclerically liberal views about fiction,⁷

¹ ix, 94.

² ix, 200.

³ Cf. Orie W. Long, "English Translations of Goethe's *Werther*," *JEGP*, xrv (1915), 173, and references there given; B. Q. Morgan, *A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation* (Madison, 1922), p. 175; Anton Kippenberg, "Die erste englische Ausgabe des *Werther*," *Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg*, v (1925), 13-21.

⁴ *Goethe en Angleterre* (Paris [1920]), pp. 3, 16; *Bibliographie de Goethe en Angleterre* (Paris, 1920), p. 9.

⁵ *MLR*, xvi (1921), 367.

⁶ London: Tregaskis, 1925.

⁷ In *Columella* (London, 1779), pp. 245-48, Graves defends the writing of novels by clergymen, and in *Eugenius* (London, 1786), i, 10-11, he praises sentimental fiction. See also the general defence of prose fiction in

he was no doubt chary of associating his name with the "apology for suicide" that took England by storm in the 1780's. But his secret was known, it seems, to at least one man of letters in his neighborhood. Carré has recently reprinted, without following the clue, a statement by the Rev. Edward Mangin: "The English translation of the 'Sorrows of Werter' is by the Rev. Richard Greaves [*sic*], of Claverton, near Bath."⁸ And Frederick Shum, in his *Catalogue of Bath Books*, records the translation among Graves's works.⁹ Shum's copy is described as bearing the autograph of Edward Mangin, and his ascription of the work to Graves may rest upon Mangin's authority.

There is further evidence to connect Graves with this version of *Werther* and to show his interest in the ethical problems which the story raised. To the 1784 and many later editions of this translation was appended an anonymous set of lackadaisical verses called *Werter to Charlotte (A little before his Death)*, beginning "O Charlotte! Charlotte! all-accomplish'd maid."¹⁰ The lines labor the point, put more succinctly later by Thackeray, that Werther is a "moral man," and go on to anticipate a chaste reunion in heaven. It should be noted that these verses, the most widely circulated of English *Wertheriaden*, are by Graves. They are included in the miscellany called *Lucubrations* which he published in 1786 under the pen-name of "Peter of Pontefract."¹¹ In this collection he has also a poem *On Suicide*, beginning "Rash youth, forbear! O lay that poniard by," placed immediately after *Werter to Charlotte*, and evidently designed as an antidote to the dangerous effect which *Werther* was said to have on romantic and splenetic English youth.

Does love, like Werter's, thy fond breast inspire?
Let reason quench, at once, th' adult'rous fire:
Nor think t' intrude amidst the blest above,
A soul defil'd with sin and guilty love.¹²

"The Apology, or a Word to the Wise," prefixed to *The Spiritual Quixote* (London, 1773), I, v-vi.

⁸ *The Parlour Window* (1841), pp. 83-84, quoted by Carré, *Bibliographie*, p. 29.

⁹ Bath, 1913, p. 93.

¹⁰ This piece is to be distinguished from another less widely circulated *Werter to Charlotte*, by Edward Taylor, also first published in 1784. Taylor's lines begin, "Lost to the world, to all its pleasures lost."

¹¹ London: J. Dodsley, pp. 199-201.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

This poem, too, found a place in at least one edition of Graves's translation, that of 1789.

The Rector of Claverton may therefore claim a place in the history of fiction not only as the author of *The Spiritual Quixote* but as the first English translator of *Werther*.

ALAN D. McKILLOP.

The Rice Institute.

THE EVE OF ST. AGNES AND THE LAY OF THE LAST MINSTREL

I wish to make a suggestion that coincidences exist between *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* and two passages in *The Eve of St. Agnes*; first, the famous stanzas of the moon-lit stained-glass window, and second, the obscure line, "clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray." The lines of Keats are familiar to all. The passage in Scott is this:

Spreading herbs, and flowerets bright,
Glistened with the dew of night;
Nor herb, nor floweret, glistened there,
But was carved in the cloister-arches as fair. . . .
 They entered now the chancel tall;
The darkened roof rose high aloof
 On pillars lofty and light and small. . . .
Full many a scutcheon and banner riven,
Shook to the cold night-wind of heaven,
 Around the screened altar's pale;
And there the dying lamps did burn. . . .
The moon on the east oriel shone
Through slender shafts of shapely stone,
 By foliated tracery combined;
Thou would'st have thought some fairy's hand
'Twixt poplars straight the ozier wand,
 In many a freakish knot, had twined;
Then framed a spell, when the work was done,
And changed the willow-wreaths to stone.
The silver light, so pale and faint,
Shewed many a prophet, and many a saint,
 Whose image on the glass was dyed;
Full in the midst, his Cross of Red
Triumphant Michael brandished,

And trampled the Apostate's pride.
 The moon-beam kissed the holy pane,
 And threw on the pavement a bloody stain.

Scott has "herbs" and "flowerets" and "foliated tracery" and "ozier wand in many a freakish knot"; Keats has "carven imag'ries Of fruits, and flowers, and bunches of knot-grass." Scott has "silver light" showing "many a prophet, many a saint," and "full in the midst" the Cross of Red; Keats has "innumerable of stains and spendid dyes" and "in the midst . . . saints, . . . a shielded scutcheon." Scott, it will be noticed, has "full many a scutcheon," which, with the banners that "shook to the cold night-wind" to the light of "the dying lamps," and "the scrolls that teach thee to live and to die" (mentioned in the first section of canto two) may be what Keats remembered as "dim enblazonings." Scott has "the moon on the east oriel shone"; Keats, "full on this casement shone the wintry moon." Scott does not say "wintry moon" but he speaks of "pale moonlight," and cold light, in the first section, and the cold night-wind in the portion quoted above. In Scott's poem the moon-beam throws from Michael's Cross of Red "on the pavement a bloody stain." Keats enlarges upon his description of Madeline and specifies the several colors thrown by the diamond panes on the various parts of her body. In addition to these details there is the general similarity of impression between Madeline's chamber (which is much more like a church than a chamber) and the "chancel tall" with its roof rising "high aloof on pillars lofty and light and small," which impression Keats conveys with his "casement high and triple arch'd."

Following in the next stanza but one of *The Eve of St. Agnes* is the much discussed line quoted above, "clasp'd like a missal where swart Paynims pray." Immediately following the window passage in Scott's poem is the narrative told by the Monk of St. Mary's Aisle to Deloraine, in which the Monk states:

I was not always a man of woe;
 For Paynim countries I have trod.

He states also that in these far Paynim climes he had met "the wondrous Michael Scott," the wizard who, repenting on his death-bed, had bequeathed to the Monk the care of his "Mighty Book." And, says the Monk,

I swore to bury his Mighty Book,
That never mortal might therein look.

The Monk and Deloraine open the tomb and see the body of Michael Scott "as if he had not been dead a day," clad "like a pilgrim from beyond the sea: His left hand held his Book of Might."

My suggestion gains, I think, some additional weight from a consideration of the word *clasp'd*. The line in *The Eve of St. Agnes*, which was written first, "Shut like a Missal," was changed to "Like a shut Missal," then to "Like a clasp'd Missal," and finally to its present form, "clasp'd like a Missal."¹ It seems clear that Keats had in mind the thought, not that the book was held fast in the hands, but that it was shut with a clasp. The lines from *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* show, if Keats had this poem in mind at all, that the second meaning is correct. For

Then Deloraine, in terror, took
From the cold hand the Mighty Book,
With non clasped, and iron bound.

The "missal" passage is obscure. One cannot, of course, trace Keats' thought. I have wondered, however, whether his clause, "where swart Paynims pray," may have meant to him in the beginning anything else than an epithet to indicate a Paynim country; and whether, having introduced the word *pray*, Michael Scott's book of incantation transformed itself in Keats' mind into a book of prayer, easy enough if Keats remembered that Michael Scott was clad "like a pilgrim from beyond the sea" and held his book as one would hold a shut book of prayer.

"Clasp'd like a Missal" may therefore have had its origin in Keats' rather vivid memory of the "Mighty Book" (probably in black-letter and illuminated like a mass-book) clasped with its clasp of iron, a book of pagan wizard lore brought from a paynim country to remain clasped forever in a land where Christians pray (in Melrose Abbey). It is at least interesting that the situation in Keats' line is exactly the reverse of that in Scott.

JOHN CLARK JORDAN.

University of Arkansas.

¹ *The Complete Works of John Keats*, edited by H. Buxton Forman. Notes on *The Eve of St. Agnes*.

BOYLESVE REDIVIVUS *

The rise of Boylesve to literary prééminence was a slow and painstaking ascent, milestoned by a series of fictional masterpieces whose subject-matter and workmanship earned their somewhat retiring author a gradually increasing band of fervent admirers, though their sobriety and finish precluded his enjoying the sensational popularity of the best seller. His first full-length novel was published in 1895 and as early as 1908 his name was being mentioned among the literati for candidacy to the Academy. By 1913 there was a well-defined movement in this direction. To quote Chauvigné,

Boylesve vivait très à l'écart du mouvement, mais il serait sans doute inexact d'avancer qu'il y était indifférent. S'il ne fit rien directement pour hâter la définitive consécration, on doit pouvoir dire que sa réputation grandissante le poussait en avant, qu'il était fort répandu dans les salons littéraires, qu'il menait une vie mondaine très spéciale, qu'il détestait d'ailleurs, qu'il devait pratiquer cependant pour la pénétrer comme psychologue, mais aussi en conquérant.¹

With the advent of the War, literature was momentarily forgotten and Boylesve, together with his wife, hastened to contribute his share to the national endeavor by enlisting in hospital service, which, however, did not prevent his election, in 1918, as an "immortal" by a large majority over his rivals for the "fauteuil" of Alfred Mézières.² Fame now threw wide its portals to him, and before long, the writer whose work had been savored by only a comparatively small group of connoisseurs was being heralded as one of the leading novelists and one of the outstanding masters of French prose of his day. Other writers clamored for prefaces from his

*René Boylesve: *le Confort moderne* (Paris, Eds. des Cahiers libres, 1926, 109 pp.); *les Deux romanciers* (Paris, J. Ferenczi et fils, 1926, 190 pp.); *la Touraine* (Paris, Emile-Paul, 1926, 113 pp.); *Azurine, ou le nouveau voyage*, avec une introduction de Gérard-Gailly (Paris, les Amis d'Edouard, No. 18, 1926, 57 pp.); *Feuilles tombées*, introduction de Charles Du Bos (Paris, Eds. de la Pléiade, 1927, 165 pp.); Auguste Chauvigné, *le Jardin secret de René Boylesve*, extraits de sa correspondance (Paris, Ferenczi, 1927, 304 pp.)

¹ *Le Jardin secret de René Boylesve*, p. 160.

² These facts are gleaned from Chauvigné, *op. cit.*, chapter entitled "l'Académicien."

pen; publishers stumbled over each other in their eagerness to obtain his manuscripts. In the eight years intervening between his election to the Academy and his death, some ten volumes appeared under his name, the year 1925 witnessing the publication, in rapid succession, of no less than three of these, *Je vous ai désirée un soir*, *Nouvelles leçons d'amour dans un parc*, and *Souvenirs du jardin détruit*. In these last works Boylesve abandoned the minute study of the Touraine of his youth which had given the stamp of immortality to such masterpieces as *Mademoiselle Cloque*, *la Becquée*, and *la Jeune fille bien élevée*, in favor of that concern for psychology which had marked *Mademoiselle jeune femme* and, in such novels as *Elise* and *Je vous ai désirée un soir*, revealed a Proustian tendency toward the pathological; or, by way of diversion, we may suppose, in favor of that eighteenth-century vein which had made of *La Leçon d'amour dans un parc* a thing of such sheer delight, and which was resumed in *le Carrosse aux deux lézards verts* and, more especially, in *les Nouvelles leçons d'amour dans un parc*. And then, with his brain teeming with plans for further work and his desk littered with embryonic manuscripts, Boylesve, his vigor sapped by his years of assiduous mental effort, succumbed to an attack of intestinal strangulation and died, after a fruitless operation, on January 14, 1926.

The months which have passed since Boylesve's death have served, on the one hand, to solidify the fame which he had so justly earned and, on the other, to fix in the memory of his surviving admirers the winsome charm which made of an hour spent in his company a never-to-be-forgotten pleasure. Through the efforts of his literary executor, M. Gérard-Gailly, his manuscripts were put into shape and eagerly sought after by competing publishers. The conservative old firm of Calmann-Lévy, which had brought out most of Boylesve's volumes either originally or in reprint, was deemed to have abused the good nature of the gracious Academician and was replaced by such newer establishments as Ferenczi, Schiffrin, le Livre, and others, and a continuous stream of posthumous writings issued from the press. Some of these dated from the early days of Boylesve's career; such, for instance, are *Azurine* and *le Confort moderne*. The latter, written as early as 1903, but not published until shortly after its author's death, is an amusing, semi-Voltairean "conte philosophique" on the introduction of the "latest improve-

ments" into the domestic and social life of a wealthy young Parisian couple. *Azurine, ou le Nouveau voyage*, brought out by M. Champion as No. 108 of the interesting series of brochures printed privately for les Amis d'Edouard, goes back to the beginnings of Boylesve's career, having been written in 1895. The "nouveau voyage" is the "log" of an automobile trip from Paris to the lac du Bourget, undertaken by the author and two friends in the summer of 1894, this group thus serving as pioneers in that latest sport of long-distance touring. The account of the trip is prefaced by an interesting introduction from the pen of M. Gérard-Gailly, entitled "René Boylesve et l'automobile," in which he studies the novelist's interest in motor-drawn vehicles and reveals him as one of the first to have made use of them for fictional purposes. It may be noted here that, by some strange oversight, M. Gérard-Gailly, in listing those of Boylesve's works in which the automobile plays a prominent rôle, makes no mention whatsoever of his first novel, *le Médecin des dames de Néans* (written in 1894), one of the principal personages of which is the possessor of a huge primitive motor-car. Between the publication of *le Confort moderne* and of *Azurine*, Ferenczi brought out *les Deux romanciers*, a collection of short-stories receiving its title from the opening tale, which had previously appeared in 1924, along with "le Mariage de Pomme d'Api" of *les Nouvelles leçons d'amour*, in the series of holograph editions of contemporary works of fiction issued by M. Champion. The Ferenczi collection is made up of six stories, one of which is "le Confort moderne," and forms an interesting sequel to such earlier volumes of short stories as *la Marchande des petits pains pour les canards* (1913), *le Bonheur à cinq sous* (1917), and *le Dangereux jeune homme* (1921).

So much for Boylesve's posthumous fiction. We now approach the two most interesting of the works published since the death of the novelist, *la Touraine* and *Feuilles tombées*. Boylesve had promised the editors of a series of works which was to compose a *Portrait de la France*, a volume on Poitiers; five days before his death, as Jean-Louis Vaudoyer tells us in a brief preface to *la Touraine*, the novelist had spoken enthusiastically of the project. The plan having been frustrated by Boylesve's untimely demise, Vaudoyer and his associates decided to issue an "album touristique" of Boylesve-confections, including "morceaux recueillis

dans divers journeaux, revues ou cahiers."³ The volume contains "le Jardin de la France," a lecture delivered in November, 1921, before the Université des *Annales*; five "Nostalgiques" which had first appeared in the *Echo de Paris* in 1919; and some "Fragments" taken from Boylesve's note-books and interesting for their biographical value. Of the first two sections of *la Touraine*, "le Jardin de la France" is a highly poetic appreciation of the author's native "pays," while "les Nostalgiques" are a priceless pendant to *Mlle Cloque*, *la Becquée*, *l'Enfant à la balustrade*, and *la Jeune fille bien élevée*. In five brief sketches, full of interesting details of the author's early home life, Boylesve describes the agitation of his family over the question as to the proper schooling for a boy of his class. All this occurred "environ deux ans après la mort de ma grand'tante Félicie" (vide *la Becquée*) "et vers la fin de l'été qui suivit nos fameuses affaires de la maison Colivaut"⁴ (vide *l'Enfant à la balustrade*). These two novels stand clearly revealed as autobiographical; and the details contained in the "Nostalgiques" of the novelist's entrance into the school of the "Frères congréganistes" at Poitiers, his first day there, his private lessons in Latin with the abbé Daru, and the effect of all this upon his boyish mind are indispensable for a thorough appreciation of his intellectual and spiritual development.

The year following Boylesve's death saw the posthumous resurrection of writings from various stages in his career: 1895, 1903, 1919. The anniversary of his death was to be marked by the publication of a work of much greater importance than *Azurine* or *le Confort moderne*, than *les Deux romanciers* or *la Touraine*, a work on which Boylesve was occupied during his entire adult life and of which he himself used to say: "Ce sera mon œuvre posthume."⁵ This work was none other than a "journal intime," a diary rather loosely kept in "carnets, calepins et pages volantes,"⁶ in which the novelist recorded his activities, noted his observations, crystallized his philosophy of life, and commented on his own and his contemporaries' aesthetic endeavors. With the permission of Mme René Boylesve and the assistance of M. Gérard-Gailly, this

³ *La Touraine*, introd., p. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁵ Vide introduction to *Feuilles tombées*, p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

amorphous journal was carefully sifted and a selection of its entries made for publication in an anniversary volume which was entitled *Feuilles tombées* and which was prefaced by an admirable personal and critical appreciation of the novelist from the pen of M. Charles Du Bos (who, incidentally, insinuates that the complete journal will eventually be published). In his introduction, M. Du Bos lauds the great personal charm of Boylesve, as he received his guests in the spacious library of his home in the rue des Vignes, and analyzes the somewhat contradictory qualities of his genius: quivering "sensibilité," Vigny-esque individualism, and profound objectivity, all of them seasoned by a thoroughly Gallic flavor that made him French of the French. The *Feuilles tombées* proper is a rather heterogeneous collection of items, some dated, many others "sans date," recounting important events in the author's domestic, social, and artistic life, or setting forth, with great clarity and vigor, his conception of the requisites of the literary profession. Many of these latter passages deserve a place among the pearls of wisdom of such aphorists as Joubert and Amiel. Such are:

Le plus sûr moyen de moraliser, pour un homme de lettres, ce n'est pas de prêcher la morale ou d'imaginer arbitrairement des intrigues aboutissant au triomphe de la vertu; mais c'est de montrer que l'on a de la conscience, et particulièrement celle de son métier.⁷

Le 'connais-toi' antique est insuffisant. Le 'aimez-vous les uns les autres' est insuffisant. C'est un 'connaissez-vous les uns les autres' que l'avenir devrait s'appliquer.⁸

Several entries are devoted to an account of the pathetic illness and death of Hugues Rebell, Boylesve's colleague of the *Ermitage* days; still others hint at the novelist's relations with the world of contemporary letters: a banquet in honor of Edmund Gosse, a "soirée" at the home of Victor Margueritte, an introduction to René Doumic by Edouard Rod. And the whole is written with that fine feeling for the music and the flavor of words which characterizes all of Boylesve's writings and made of him one of the unquestioned masters of French prose of his time.

Thus far, we have been considering works of Boylesve's own composition; we now turn to a work by Auguste Chauvigné entitled

⁷ *Feuilles tombées*, p. 54.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

le Jardin secret de René Boylesve. Chauvigné, in his capacity of "secrétaire perpétuel de la Société d'Agriculture, Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres d'Indre-et-Loire," had welcomed Boylesve, on the occasion of the presentation by the Société of the "épée académique,"⁹ with an address on "l'Esprit de la Touraine dans l'œuvre de René Boylesve," which was published in the *Annales* of the society for the year 1921. The *Jardin secret* is, as Chauvigné tells us in his "avertissement," neither a biography nor a bibliography; it is rather, a sketchy *aperçu* of the life and work of Boylesve as understood at the conclusion of a forty-three-year friendship cemented by numerous *tête-à-tête* and an extensive correspondence. The title of Chauvigné's book is to be taken in its literal denotation as well as in its figurative connotation; on the one hand, we are told of Boylesve's fondness for gardens, of his love of the park contiguous to his Passy home and his dismay when this park was destroyed to make way for the erection of a block of houses, and, finally, of his never-realized ambition to possess a garden-surrounded home in that garden of France, la Touraine. On the other hand, and this was Boylesve's real "jardin secret," we are given glimpses into his heart and mind and soul, that tripartite park where all his great works were born and all his noble ideals flourished. This Chauvigné achieves by the reproduction of a large number of notes and letters hitherto *inédites*, addressed to him by the novelist, and welded together by passages of commentary which furnish us with numerous biographical details of the utmost importance and acquaint us with his gentleness of manner and charming affability. From Boylesve's "premiers pas sur la voie sacrée" through the period of his finest achievements to his election to the Academy and his "derniers rêves," Chauvigné carries us, in a tone that is adulatory but not hyperbolic, in a style which, though not distinguished, is adequate. To the future biographer of Boylesve, this work will be invaluable for significant details on Boylesve's first literary efforts, written in 1884 and 1885 while he was still a student at the *lycée* of Tours and signed with his real name, René Tardiveau; on the

⁹ In May, 1921, in honor of his election to the Academy, this Tourangelle organization presented Boylesve with an "épée académique"; Boylesve responded with a "conférence" on "Liberté et littérature" (vide Chauvigné, pp. 176-84).

narrowly-averted lawsuit threatened by the family of the music-teacher of Tours, who had been made to serve, under a slightly disguised name, as one of the characters of *la Jeune fille bien élevée*, when that novel was appearing in serial form in the *Revue des deux mondes* (the name was completely altered when the novel was published in book form and the stupid wrath of the provincial family thus mollified); and on Boylesve's Academic candidacy, election, and reception.

AARON SCHAFER.

The University of Texas.

A NOTE ON THE DATE OF WINNERE AND WASTOURE

One of the evidences Professor Steadman used for establishing the year 1352-3 as the date of *Winnere and Wastoure*¹ was the reference in line 317 of the poem to William Shareshull, who at that time was Chief Justice of the King's Bench. As Chief Justice, Shareshull was called upon to officiate in various cases of disturbance of the peace, such as that mentioned in the poem. Around the middle of the century many of these disturbances came, as Professor Steadman explained, from just such economic conditions as the author of *Winnere and Wastoure* discusses. Professor Steadman mentioned Knighton's reference to one such uprising in Chester in 1353 and Shareshull's connection with it. Knighton's report is as follows:

Anno gratiae MCCCCLIII sederunt iusticiarii apud Cestriam super le Eyre magno tempore; et in defensionem eorum ne compatriotae eos nocerent assistebant prope in patria principes Walliae, Henricus dux Lancastriae, comes Warwych, comes Stafford, pro timore patriae. Iusticiarii, dominus Ricardus de Wylughby, dominus Willelmus de Sharshull. . . Illi de patria Cestriae videntes enormitatem delictorum suorum, et se non posse pro tempore in iudicio pro fortitudine adversa contendere, finem fecerunt cum principe Walliae domino suo pro v. mille marcis et lx. solvendis infra iiij. annos proxime sequentes, et fecerunt securitatem qualem princeps petere voluerit, ea quidem conditioe quod le Eyre non transiret super eos. Cumque se crederent esse quietos et liberatos in toto, iusticiarii

¹ J. M. Steadman, "The Date of Winnere and Wastoure," *Mod. Phil.*, xix (November, 1921), 211 ff.

sederunt de novo super Traylbastons, et levaverunt pecuniam ultra mensuram, et multae terrae et tenementa seiscita in manus principis, et fines multas fecerunt quasi sine numero.²

Professor Steadman explained further:

Wincre and Wastoure was written by a man who speaks of himself (ll. 8 and 32) as a western man, and it is entirely possible (though I do not assert that it is probable) that, living in the West of England, where this uprising occurred, he had heard of Sharesnull's connection with this disturbance of the peace and that he knew something of the cause of this disturbance.³

Desiring more light on this problem, I made a search of the Chester records for further information as to the uprising. I found references to this same disturbance and to Sharesnull's connection with it in the Chester Chamberlain's Accounts for 1353-4:

20ll. 12s. 3d. received of fines and issues before the said William de Sharesnull and his fellows assigned to hear and determine divers felonies and trespasses on Monday next after the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the 27th year, in respect of a part of the 1209l. 8s. 8d. contained in three rolls of estreats to be delivered to the Chamberlain,⁴

and

825l. 16s. 8d. received of the community of the county of Chester, as well within liberty as without, except the city of Chester, for the terms of Christmas and the Nativity of St. John the Baptist this year, in part payment of 5000 marks for a certain fine made with the Lord the Prince of Wales by the said community for certain liberties granted to them and having respite of the eyre of the Justice for thirty years from the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the 27th year, atterminated to be paid within four years next following, this year being the first; . . .⁵

I also found in the Chester Recognizance Rolls, records of the protest of the citizens of Chester against the presence of the justices and of the agreement made with the Prince that Chester should be free from the justice in eyre for thirty years; the record reads as follows:

² *Chronicle of Henry Knighton*, Rolls Series, London, 1889-1895, II, 75.

³ J. M. Steadman, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

⁴ Stewart-Brown, Ronald, ed., "Accounts of the Chamberlains and Other Officers of the County of Chester," 1301-1360, *The Record Society for the Publication of Original Documents relating to Lancashire and Chester*, LIX, 211.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

1353. An eyre having been summoned by Edward Prince of Wales, to be held at Chester, on Monday next after the Feast of the Assumption of St. Mary, the commonalty stated that the holding of the same would be contrary to their laws, and, on payment of a fine of 5,000 marks, the holding of the eyre was respited for thirty years: [26 and 27 Edw. 3. M. 4 (2)] Record defective.*

That the justices in eyre did hold sessions at Chester in spite of this agreement we know from the records in the Chester Chamberlain's Accounts, and that the uprising was at least partly a result of the presence of the justices in Chester cannot be doubted. But that this particular uprising was the one to which the author of *Winere and Wastoure* referred I cannot prove, although the evidence that it was seems at least worthy of consideration. Although I found records of similar disturbances in 1352 in Northampton⁷ and Surrey⁸ in which Sharesnull was involved, I have been unable to find a record of any such uprising, except that at Chester, between 1349 and 1365 in any part of England which might be called West. At any rate, none of the details in the records of the Chester disturbance contradict the details in the poem. If, however, the Chester uprising is the one to which the author of *Winere and Wastoure* referred, then it is impossible that the poem was written earlier than 1353.

University of Minnesota.

JESSE MAY ANDERSON.

REVIEWS

La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle. Par GEORGES ASCOLI. Paris, Gamber, 1927. 352 pp. Travaux et Mémoires de l'Université de Lille.

The many students of relations between France and Britain will find much to interest them in this book, which describes the vary-

* "Welsh Records. Calendar of Recognizance Rolls of the Palatinate of Chester," *The Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, London, 1875, xxxvi, Appendix II, 92.

⁷ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, London, 1907, ix, 277.

⁸ *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, London, 1906, ix, 421.

ing impressions produced upon the French during more than two centuries by their northern neighbors. During the Hundred Years War the two nations had ample opportunity to study each other at close range. The Battle of Azincourt, the burning of Joan of Arc,¹ and the departure of the English troops from Paris are among the events that inspired comment. M. Ascoli finds that, while certain accounts are profoundly anti-British, others show that the French did not always regret the substitution of an English overlord for one of their own nation. To most Frenchmen of the day the English appeared physically powerful, brave, and independent, but proud, cruel, treacherous at times. They make frequent reference to our ancestors' love of drink and are somewhat shocked by their disloyalty to their rulers. When the war was over there were many events that brought out expressions of French opinion, such as negotiations over Calais, the marriages of Louis XII to a sister of Henry VIII and of James V of Scotland to two French princesses, the notorious executions of Thomas More, Anne Boleyn, and Mary Queen of Scots. M. A. devotes an appendix of over 100 pages to the publication of French poems concerned with these judicial murders. Religious persecution sent Huguenots to England, English Catholics to France, especially to Douai, Rheims, and Paris. There were also scholars, politicians, and other types of travelers who crossed the Channel for less imperative reasons. The Scotch guards of Louis XI were the forerunners of men like Adam Blackwood, who established themselves definitively in France. Opinions of the British were also based upon histories, written largely in Latin, books of travel, and romantic tales that dealt with historical persons or with localities in the British Isles.²

M. A. discusses the relationships between the two countries in detail and also their effect upon French writers. He finds that the poets who visited Great Britain, Ronsard, Grévin, and Du Bartas, were little influenced by what they saw. A certain number of English words passed into French,³ but English literature

¹ A. refers to various works devoted to Joan as late as the seventeenth century. The tragedy of 1606 he mentions (p. 217) had already been published in 1603; cf. P. Lacroix, *Catalogue Solennel*, 1 sup., no. 150.

² A. notes (p. 127) that the story of Edward III and the Countess of Salisbury appears in France for the first time in an adaptation by Belleforest of one of Bandello's *novelle*. The elements of the story go back, however, to Froissart and Jehan le Bel; cf. my article in *M. P.*, xviii (1920), 346. Since he includes the *Orlando furioso* (pp. 130, 131) among the works that contain scenes laid in Scotland, he might also have mentioned the *Aurelio e Isabela* of Juan de Flores, several times translated into French during the sixteenth century; cf. Reynier, *le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée*, Paris, Colin, 1908, pp. 77 ff.

³ A. cites (p. 37) Colgrave's definition of *godon* as "a filthy glutton;

exerted no influence upon French authors before the seventeenth century. A. finds parallel dialogues in the two languages as early as 1483, but no real grammar until that of Jacques Bellot in 1580 and no real English-French dictionary earlier than the edition of Cotgrave with its English-French supplement that appeared in 1632.⁴ A. shows that the first English book translated into French was a voyage by Frobisher in 1578, followed in 1590 by an account of Virginia. British men of letters who won a hearing in France wrote in Latin. Of these only two were of considerable importance, Thomas More in his *Utopia* and Buchanan in his translations and imitations of classical plays.⁵

The book is full of information, presented in an interesting manner. It is valuable not only for the period treated, but as constituting an introduction to the centuries that followed, when English influence in France became of much greater consequence. It is to be hoped that M. A. will be able to do for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries what he has done so well for the fifteenth and sixteenth.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy, Collected and Edited by
FRANZ RICKABY. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1926.
xli+244 pp.

"Ballad making," says Professor Gummere over and over again, "is a closed account." They can no longer be made, at any rate, not by civilized peoples. Of course, ballads like those of fifteenth and sixteenth century England are gone; but ballad making itself

is that hath, etc." This seems to be a misprint. I read in the edition of 1632 "a filthie glutton, or swiller; one that hath, etc."

⁴He overlooks John Minshew's *Guide into the Tongues*, London, 1617. This polyglot dictionary was called to my attention by Dr. Blondheim. As the English words are given first and French is one of the eleven languages with which the author was concerned, the work must have been as useful as the far smaller supplement to Cotgrave that appeared 15 years later.

⁵In a note on p. 202 A. corrects the attribution to Buchanan by Sidney Lee and others of a Latin play of which the *Ephésienne*, published in 1614, is supposed by them to have been a translation. He shows how the error arose in the same way that I did in my *French Tragi-comedy* (Baltimore, 1907, p. 173). He admits that Brinon may have written the *Ephésienne*, but doubts his translating Buchanan's *Jephthes* and *Baptistes*. I hope to show in a book shortly to appear that, while Brinon probably translated *Jephthes*, there is no evidence that he translated *Baptistes* or composed *l'Ephésienne*.

is still far from dead; nor will it die till automobile and radio have utterly destroyed all homogeneous groups and reduced mankind to a cosmopolitan uniformity. We have at least abundant evidence that ballads, essentially like those of the late Middle Ages, however different in form and theme and accent, were composed in the last century in this country. Mr. Lomax has given us the songs of the cowboy and the frontier; Mr. Odum and Miss Scarborough those of the negro; Professor Gray, and now Professor Rickaby, the songs and ballads of the shanty-boy.

Professor Rickaby has produced a notable book. He has brought together fifty-one ballads once popular in the pneries of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, in seventy-five versions. A few have been printed before, but for the most part they have been taken down by the editor from the lips of men who once sang them. The sources of the texts, their history, vivid glimpses of the singers, and much interesting information besides, are given in the notes. There is an adequate, though by no means exhaustive, glossary, and indexes of titles and of first lines. And not least of Mr. Rickaby's virtues is that, whenever possible, he has given us not only the words the lumberjacks sang, but the music as well. The little old lady of the North Countree who told Sir Walter Scott that to print the ballads is to destroy them, would have taken him to her heart for that. The introduction gives a colorful, now and then, perhaps, too highly colored, picture of the life out of which these ballads sprang—the heroic days of lumbering, before machines bred efficiency and I. W. W's. Doubtless the old shanty-boy in actual life, when he came out of the woods in the springtime and filled up on squirrel whiskey, was a rather difficult person, not at all the sentimental innocent of his songs; but he was an innocent for all that, with the wonder and spontaneity of a child, and a child's noisy irresponsibility. That was the reason he could sing, so long as he was well fed and well clothed and not too badly housed. And you could no more make a machine-tender of him than you could of a lusty school-boy. The lumber barons did just that; and the shanty-boy disappeared, and his songs all died together. Mr. Rickaby has made them live for us again.

They are poor enough stuff even at their best—sentimental ditties like "Gerry's Rocks" and the "The Banks of the Little Eau Pleine," or downright drivel like "Harry Bail" (no. 27); but they give even so a sense of life, of simple, fearless men who knew their jobs and did them till they went down in a log-jam, or lay crushed under fallen branches, or what was worse—till that day came when the labor agency decided that they wouldn't do. More than one ballad voices this deep dread of the old age and poverty which the shanty-boy foresaw and could not, would not, avert. And in the meantime he sang his exploits, his skill, his loves and hates, and his deep, rich enjoyment in it all. *Carpe diem*. There

are many worse philosophies, and not many so attractive. But there were other songs, too, popular among the men in the camps, songs of shipping on the Great Lakes (nos 45, 46, and 47), of the fighting of British soldiers in India, and of the immortal prize-fight between Heenan and Sayers on April 17, 1860 at Farnborough, in Hampshire. Professor Kittredge's note to this ballad makes one wish that he would turn his hand to the history of pugilism. Ballads like these tell us, as Mr. Rickaby points out, of the antecedents of many of the shanty-boys. A goodly number of them were Irishmen who had sailed the seven seas and fought for the Queen on the Indian frontier. But all alike, Irish, French, Canadian, and Yankee, sang them with equal gusto, as they sang the exploits of John Paul Jones off the Irish coast (no. 44) and the direful story of the sinking of the *Cumberland* in Hampton Roads (no. 39).

These songs surely afford no support to the theory of communal authorship, nor can Mr. Rickaby find such support in those that sprang more immediately out of the life of the woods. On that point he is decisive: "In regard to the origin of woods songs there is no problem: they are composed by individuals who set out definitely to compose. No other theory is logically possible, it seems to me." They are made, indeed, by men like the redoubtable Shan T. Boy (W. T. Allen), who is responsible for several of the ballads in this collection (nos. 5, 11, 12, and 20). The best of all is "Silver Jack" (no. 32), which, as Mr. Lomax suggested, is probably the work of a clever newspaper man. But it was popular among the cowboys of Texas and the woodsmen of Michigan. The inferences that may be drawn from this concerning the authorship of the ballads in Child need not be pressed.

Mr. Rickaby's scholarship is impeccable; and for all that he has executed his task with such obvious spirit and gusto, he has never departed from the rigorous editorial standards that Grundtvig and Child imposed upon collectors of ballads old and new. We have but one slight correction. In that egregious but amusing piece *Ole from Norway* (no. 36), popular in the writer's youth on the Minnesota prairies no less than in the North Woods, occur the lines:

They say I'm a Norsk from Norway
Som lever po Lutfisk og sil.

In his notes, Mr. Rickaby writes: "that is, *Som Lever paa Lodsfsk og Sil*,—'who lives on pilot-fish and launce.'" Now *Lutfisk* is almost certainly not *Lodsfsk* (pilot-fish) but lutefisk ("dried cod steeped in a lye of potash"), the staple dish, as many barbarians believe, of Norway; and *sil*, in all probability, is not *sil* at all, but a blunder for *sild*, i. e., herring. *Lutefisk og sild*,—to a Yankee poetaster that spelled *norsk*.

To those who knew Professor Rickaby the book will bring a feeling of melancholy that he did not live to see it published. They know with what exuberant delight he would have turned the leaves and chanted the songs he knew so well, the quiet satisfaction he would have felt in long labors so brilliantly brought to an end. And they would have rejoiced to bring to an unpretentious scholar the praise he had so abundantly earned, and would hardly know how to receive.

MARTIN B. RUUD.

The University of Minnesota.

Beowulf. Translated into Modern English Rhyming Verse, with Introduction and notes, by ARCHIBALD STRONG, M. A., D. Litt., Jury Professor of English in the University of Adelaide. With a Foreword on 'Beowulf and the Heroic Age,' by R. W. CHAMBERS, D. Litt., Quain Professor of English in the University of London. Pp. lii+100. London, Constable and Company, Ltd., 1925.

This is an excellent rendering of the noble old poem, which will give pleasure alike to those who do not know the original and to those—a more difficult lot—who do. The verse is the long swinging couplet of *Sigurd the Volsung*, that stirring measure which long years since thrilled at least one eager young reader and converted him to poetry.

There was a dwelling of Kings ere the world was
waxen old;
Dukes were the door-wards there, and the roofs were thatched
with gold;

And Professor Strong has caught the music, and returned it, though not slavishly, in finely wrought harmony of his own:

Lo, oft have we heard how the folk-kings of the Danes
in the years long sped
Won glory, and how their athlings wrought deeds
of might and dread.

But strong and rich as is the metre, what it evokes is not the *Beowulf* after all, but William Morris. And perhaps that is near enough, though for our part we think that Morris himself somehow came closer in his own sounding version, so often unintelligible without recourse to the original, and not always intelligible even then. Or if, perversely, one insists on sense too, then Professor Leonard in his fine translation published three or four years ago.

The introduction orientates briefly and competently in the usual matters—date, origin, fabric of the poem, its legendary and historical backgrounds, metre, spirit, and the like; and there is a short list of books likely to be of service to the general reader and the student.

But Professor Chambers' *Foreward* will have a far wider appeal, for here in a little less than thirty pages is the wisest and most searching interpretation we know of the great age that gave us the *Beowulf*—an age of sound learning and rich culture, a renaissance comparable to that of age of Elizabeth, and perhaps even more significant in the history of England and of mankind. Professor Chambers's essay seems to us one of those rare fruits of the finest scholarship—how rare they are!—in which understanding and imagination have subdued the refractory materials of learning till they come to yield up to us their secret.

MARTIN B. RUUD.

The University of Minnesota.

Goethe, von MOELLER VAN DEN BRUCK. [Die Deutschen, unsere Menschengeschichte. Sechster Band]. I. C. C. Bruns Verlag, Minden i. W. [ohne Jahr].

Der deutschen Jugend gewidmet ringt dieses Buch ehrlich mit dem Problem Goethe ohne doch eigentlich zur Gestalt durchzudringen. Eine Zwiespältigkeit im Verfasser selbst scheint mir der Hauptgrund dieses Misslingens zu sein. Fest davon überzeugt, dass jede wahre Kunst national bedingt ist, dass nur Selbstbetrug über diese nationale Gebundenheit der Kunst hinwegzutauschen vermag (S. 7), muss er doch zugeben, dass Goethe die Grenzen des Deutschtums schon heute überrage. Es sei ein Universalismus, der zunächst in seinem Fundamente durchaus national sei, der aber auswachse zu einem nationalen Universalismus und die Schranken von Raum und Zeit mit der ganzen Macht des Genius durchbreche (S. 11). Der Anfang dieser Wirkung Goethes nun sei die Tatsache, dass andere Völker wissen, "er ist da, ebenso wie sie wissen, dass das deutsche Volk da ist . . . Ihr Ende wird hoffentlich dereinst sein, dass sie die Menschen nicht zu lauter Goethes, wohl aber zu Deutschen gemacht hat" (S. 9).

Das sind unbegreifliche Widersprüche in des Autors eigenen Worten, zumal wenn später (S. 174) die nationale Gebundenheit als völlig unüberwindlich dargestellt wird: "Hier aber an einen Ausgleich unter den Völkern zu denken, der mehr wäre als blos ein Ausgleich des Wissens, sondern wirklich ein Ausgleich des

Gefühls, ist eiteles Hoffen. Froh wollen wir vielmehr sein, wenn die Völker immer nur das deutliche Bewusstsein ihrer Nationalkunst haben."

Wie nun, wenn aber der Nationalismus Goethes gerade daraus hervorginge, dass er über die nationale Gebundenheit hinaus die Fähigkeit besessen hatte, sich einerseits anderer Völker Güter anzueignen, andererseits durch die Allseitigkeit seines Genius zu ihnen durch seine Werke zu sprechen? Da liegt ein Problem der Weltliteratur, das noch kaum ernstlich in Angriff genommen ist und das wohl der Behandlung wert wäre.

Aber auch aus zeitlicher Gebundenheit verschliesst sich Moeller van den Bruck der unvoreingenommenen Ein- und Aussicht. "Weil wir selbst in heraufsteigender Zeit und in einem bejahten Abschnitt unserer Nationalgeschichte leben und arbeiten, die der Frühantike und Frührenaissance zu(?) leben, während zuletzt noch das französische Barock auf das römische zurückgriff und dieses wieder dem pergamenischen nahestand" (S. 8), ist es dem Verfasser unmöglich, die zeitgebundene Einstellung Goethes auf den Klassizismus und die damals bekannte Antike zu billigen, ja zu verstehen.

Trotz seines Bestrebens, in Goethe immer wieder den Werdenden, den sich immer neu Vollendenden zu erkennen, verfällt er fortwährend dem Fehler, auch jederzeit den Vollendeten zu fordern. Es geht doch grundsätzlich nicht an, von dem Goethe, den wir eben als Goethe und durch Goethe kennen, zu fordern, dass er in gewissen Phasen seines Lebens anders sei. Man kann ihn als Ganzes bejahen oder ablehnen, aber nicht von einer Stufe seines Entwicklungsganges verlangen, dass sie aus andern Voraussetzungen hervorgehen solle. Daraus eben entsteht ja sein Universalismus, dass er mit einer Polarität sondergleichen für die Nachfahren als Ganzes vereinigt, was zeitlich hintereinander liegt, was zeitlich sich widerstreitet und was in gewaltiger Synthese doch schliesslich die monumentale Gestalt Goethes, des grössten Deutschen und vielleicht des grössten Menschen überhaupt ausmacht. In einzelnen Lichtblicken kommt Moeller van den Bruck dieser Erkenntnis auch nahe (z. B. S. 15), während er an andern Stellen seines Buches fast bis zur Schulmeisterei herabsinkt.

Daran ist vielleicht die Darstellungsform des Werkes selbst schuld. Man kann eben diesen dynamischen Menschen nicht statisch fassen; noch weniger ist es möglich, ganze Stufen seiner Entwicklung unter wertenden Schlagworten erstarren zu lassen. Der junge Goethe ist nicht der 'Verirrte,' denn ein Verirren setzt einen festen und bestimmten Weg voraus, den er hätte wandeln müssen, während er es eigentlich war, der uns diesen Weg zeigte. Kann man dem unreifen Jüngling vorwerfen, dass er an Gegebenes anknüpfte und es vollendend zu Neuem weiterschritt? Wo war die "Jugend um ihn her, die statt der Mache und der ewigen Regel

wieder das freie Gesetz und die Schöpfung suchten" (S. 42) und denen er sich nicht verband?

Und auch 'der Verschwärmte' ist der frühe Weimarerer, der italienische Goethe nicht, er der gerade zu jener Zeit das Auge für die Entdeckung des Gesetzes scharfte; ja, Weimar und Italien bedeuten geradezu Gesetz für ihn, jenes das gesellschaftliche, dieses das künstlerische, das wissenschaftliche. Der Sturm und Drang suchte nicht die Natur schlechthin, sondern die Vielheit in der Natur, Goethe aber die Einheit, die den Reichtum der Erscheinungen im Typus zusammenfasste. Seiner Natur gemäss, welche die Dinge nicht in der Idee, nicht abstrakt erfassen konnte, erfuhr er dies Gesetz in der Gestalt der Antike. Da diese Verkörperung des Typusgedankens nun nicht sofort als Beiwerk von ihm abfiel, können wir in der Erkenntnis seines innersten Wesens ihm daraus einen Vorwurf machen? Niemand kann dies schöner als Goethe fassen, wenn er sagt: "Das Persönliche entwickelt sich aus einem selbständigen, unerklärlichen Keime, und die Entwicklung wird durch die äusseren Umstände bloss begünstigt. Das Ganze nähert sich dadurch der wirklichen Natur, wo der Mensch, dem es nicht an eigener Lebenskraft fehlt, nie bloss durch die ihn umgebende Welt bestimmt wird, aber auch nie alles aus sich selbst entwickelt." Nirgends überspannt der Verfasser, der diese Stelle selbst zitiert (S. 147), seine Forderungen so weit, als in der Abneigung gegen die Antike und im Verlangen nach gotischer, naturalistischer Kunst. Er übersieht aber auch das Element der letzteren, wo sich die Synthese der beiden Stile bereits vollzogen hat, z. B. im Hexameter des goethischen Epos, dem man immer noch seine deutsche Rhythmik und Melodie nicht zugestehen will, und in dem Zeitbild der *Wahlverwandschaften*.

In diesem Roman eine *Losung* des Problems zu fordern, geht durchaus über die Grenzen der dichterischen Aufgabe hinaus; der Dichter stellt das Problem, die *Losung* bleibt uns vorbehalten. Gerade daraus, dass er es nicht löst, ergibt sich die in Goethes Schaffen so seltene strenge Tragödie, deren doppelte Quelle aus den gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen seiner Umwelt und Goethes eignen ethischen Anschauungen fliesst. Wie Ibsen setzt er hier der Missdeutung eines vorhergegangenen eigenen Werkes (*Wilhelm Meister*) das Korrektiv eines neuen gegenüber.

Auch im Einzelnen leidet das Buch Moeller van den Brucks an unhistorischer Einstellung ("die Zwergenhaftigkeit des achzehnten Jahrhunderts in ästhetischen Dingen" (S. 47)—und wie wir's dann zuletzt so herrlich weit gebracht!) und an gefährlichen Verallgemeinerungen:

Goethe habe sich nie im Liede einzugestehen vermocht, was ihn an die äusserste Grenze des Unglücks geworfen (S. 28)—ich erinnere nur an die Marienbader Elegie!

Der Schmerz, den er Friederike zugefügt hatte, habe ihn zuerst ganz gleichgültig gelassen, während er nichts eiligeres zu tun gehabt habe, als das Lotteerlebnis loszuwerden—zwischen Sesenheim und *Gotz* liegt weniger Zeit als zwischen Wetzlar und Werther.

“Von seinem Verhältnis zu derjenigen Frau, zu der er die tiefste Beziehung hatte, eine leidenschaftliche und geistige zugleich, handelt kein Gedicht” (S. 70)—“Warum gabst du uns die tiefen Blicke,” *An den Mond*, “Den Einzigen, Lida, welchen du lieben kannst”?

Völlig falsch dagegen ist es, Goethe einen Don Juan zu nennen zu der Zeit, als er sich nach Strassburg “in neuen Abenteuern, doch ohne dass sie einen bestimmten Gegenstand gehabt hätten, umtrieb” (S. 29). Dazu fühlte er viel zu tief den Fluch des Unbehausten.

Die ganze Chronologie zwischen Wetzlar und *Werther* ist ungenau. Vom ‘Fluch des Kain’ spricht Goethe am 12. Juni 73, wo er noch über Einsamkeit klagt, noch bei Jah rung des Volperts-hauser Balles einen Angsttraum hat; der Humor ist durchaus noch nicht Herr geworden—Die Warnung “Sei ein Mann, und folge mir nicht nach,” vor die zweite Ausgabe des *Werther* gesetzt, gehört überhaupt erst in das Jahr 1775.

Seite 66 verfälscht der Druckfehler ‘Geschmeidigkeit meines Wesen’s (statt ‘Geschwindigkeit’) den Sinn der Stelle, die übrigens hier in ihrer ganzen grundlegenden Bedeutung für Goethes Weimarer Erfahrung garr nicht erkannt ist (siehe meinen Aufsatz “Goethes *Werther* als nervöser Charakter,” *Germanic Review*, vol. I, no. 3, p. 251 und Korffs Festrede, *Jahrb. der G. G.* 12, S. 1 ff.). Auf derselben Seite steht ‘Plundersweiler’ statt ‘Plundersweilern.’

Immerhin, soviel im Einzelnen und im Ganzen verfehlt erscheinen mag, es wäre ungerecht, nicht anzuerkennen, wie gut und klar die Darstellung von Goethes wissenschaftlichen Verdiensten, von Goethes Verhältnis zu Kant und manche andere Teile des Buches geraten sind. Trotz seinen Fehlern bleibt es eine anregende Studie, die in spätern Auflagen, wenn der Verfasser die Zwiespältigkeit seiner eignen Einstellung zu überwinden vermag, an Bedeutung gewinnen müsste.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Guillén de Castro y Bellvis, La Tragedia por los celos. Edited by HYMAN ALPERN. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1926.

This dissertation presents in an able manner information concerning an important character in Spanish literature and adds a good edition of one of his plays to the small number of critical

texts available for the study of his theater. The author of the book has hunted the texts of the play in the European libraries, has considered the date and the sources of the work, and has given a critical estimate.

On p. 17 mention is made of the fact that there appeared in 1861 a Spanish edition of Castro's *Don Quijote de la Mancha* by Ventura de la Vega. A rather misleading remark follows: "This was reprinted in 1905 at Valencia by the Societat Lo Rat-Penat, with an introduction, stage directions, and notes in catalán, by Cebrián Mezquita." If Mr. Alpern means that the latter work is a reprint of Ventura de la Vega's edition, he is mistaken. Cebrián Mezquita affirms on page v of the introduction of his edition:

La present reproducció de l'obra de Guillem de Castro s'ha pres fidelment de la Primera Part de les de est'autor, edició de Valencia de 1621, —eixemplar únic conegut en Espanya, que se conserva en la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.

In speaking of the influence of Castro, on p. 22 of the introduction, Mr. Alpern holds that his *Don Quijote* formed the basis of Guérin de Bouscal's *Dom Quichot*. In a foot-note on p. 17 it is stated that Castro's *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, published at Valencia in 1618 and again in 1621, was translated into French in 1638 by Guérin de Bouscal. Mr. Alpern adds: "See E. J. Crooks: *A Critical Edition of Guérin de Bouscal's Dom Quichot de la Manche*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1925." I do not know why Mr. Alpern attributes to me the assertion that Guérin de Bouscal imitated Castro's play. It is unwise to cite a work which one has not read. Mr. Alpern has not seen my edition of Guérin de Bouscal's *Dom Quichot de la Mancha*, for although through an error, for which I was in no way responsible, this edition was announced to be in press, it has never been sent to the publishers. Instead of crediting to me a statement, which I know to be untrue, it would have been better to give as authority persons who have made the assertion and whose works are listed in the bibliography of the dissertation, such as Adolphe de Puibusque, *Histoire comparée des littératures espagnole et française* (Paris, 1843), II, 171, 172, G. Ticknor, who quotes Puibusque in his *Histoire de la littérature espagnole* (Paris, 1870), II, 342, or Cebrián Mezquita, p. v of the *Prohemi* to his edition of Castro's *Don Quixote de la Mancha* (Valencia, 1905). It is clear that not one of the three men cited has compared Castro's play with that of Guérin de Bouscal, for, though the French dramatist used the Cardenio episode of Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, there is no evidence that he was familiar with Castro's imitation of it. An important element of the Spanish play is Castro's invention of the mistaken identity of the two leading male characters. When Cardenio discovers that he is of noble birth and that his rich rival is the son

of the humble people with whom Cardenio has passed his boyhood, he makes known his love for the aristocratic Luscinda and the "marqués" marries the peasant Dorotea. Castro lays decided emphasis on the unworthy thoughts and mean deeds of the supposed nobleman. The main characters of the two plays are of the same type and bear similar relationship to each other, but that is due to their common source. The French writer uses none of Castro's changes in plot and there is no case of verbal resemblance to the Spanish play. The first attribution of the imitation by Guérin de Bouscal must have been based merely on the similarity of title, without a comparison of texts. Other critics, in repeating the statement, have not investigated the facts.

If, on the basis of title, one were establishing the influence of Castro upon French authors, there might be included the name of Pichou, who, in *Les Folies de Cardénio* (1629), dramatized the same episode from Cervantes' novel as did Castro in *Don Quixote de la Mancha*. Pichou makes no use of Castro's invention of the lowly birth of Fernant in order to explain his actions. As in Cervantes, the noble nature of Fernant asserts itself and causes him to decide rightly in regard to the two women. Pichou, like Castro, begins his work with conversation between the lovers and puts into the action of the play the main events of their love affairs, instead of giving them in *récit*, as does Cervantes. This change, which is natural in the dramatization of a novel, does not indicate, in idea or in expression, influence of the Spanish play. Another title which might suggest imitation of Guillén de Castro is *Le Curieux impertinent* (1645) by de Brosse, which is a play based on the same story from *Don Quixote* as Castro's *El curioso impertinente* (1618). De Brosse resembles Castro in the motivation of the surrender of the heroine to Lotario through adding the belief that her husband's frequent absences from home are due to his love for another woman, but de Brosse does not use Castro's addition of a former love affair between the heroine and Lotario, and of Lotario's withdrawal in favor of his friend Anselmo. The French comedy, like the Spanish play, does not have a tragic ending. The points of resemblance might easily have occurred to de Brosse independently, and do not prove that he used Castro's play as a model. This is the opinion of Georg Babinger in his dissertation, *Wanderungen und Wandelungen der Nouvelle von Cervantes 'El curioso impertinente' mit spezieller Untersuchung von Brosse's 'Le curieux impertinent'* (Erlangen, 1911). The *Segunda Parte* of Castro's plays, published in Valencia in 1625, contains a play, *La fuerza de la sangre*, which bears the same title as Hardy's *La Force du sang*, published in Paris in 1626. Hardy says in the *Argument* that his work is written in the same words as those of Cervantes' novel, *La fuerza de la sangre*.

A few changes have been introduced by Hardy, but these do not appear in Castro's imitation except a child's conversation, which is similar in naturalness but different in wording, and the hero's regretful memories of his base act against an innocent girl. Hardy does not mention a number of other inventions by Castro, such as the fact that the heroine's marriage to Don Diego was to take place on the night that she was dishonored by Grisante and that she finds the possibility of her marriage to Grisante complicated by his shipwreck and by her cousin's desire to marry him because she believes that she was wronged by him. The conclusion is that Cervantes was Hardy's only source. The consideration of these plays contributes nothing to the knowledge of Castro's influence in France, but they are worthy of investigation, especially if titles are to suggest imitation.

The question of Guillén de Castro's influence is, however, a subordinate part of the dissertation. The main purpose, to edit a play and discuss the facts pertaining more directly to it, has been very satisfactorily accomplished and the edition is a valuable contribution to the study of the seventeenth century Spanish theater.

ESTHER J. CROOKS.

Goucher College.

Middelnerlandse Legenden en Exempelen. Bijdrage tot de kennis van de prozalitteratuur en het volksgeloof der middeleeuwen, herziene en vermeerderde uitgave door Dr. C. G. N. DE VOOYS, Groningen, Den Haag, J. B. Wolters, 1926, xii + 374 pp. f 5.90.

Ever since the importance of the mediaeval *exempla* was first pointed out by an American scholar, T. F. Crane, and this vast field of mediæval fiction surveyed, the material has grown under the hands of the investigators, and now forms quite a stately library all by itself. The present volume, first published in 1900 in the form of a dissertation, professes to give a survey of this form of literature in the Netherlands, *i. e.* Holland, Belgium and the (formerly) Flemish parts of France. Bearing in mind the peculiar position of this region, between France and Germany, traversed by the great pilgrim road from Paris to Cologne, one will not be inclined to underestimate the rôle of Middle Dutch letters in the study of the European Middle Ages, least of all for this particular form of literature with its semi-ecclesiastical character. Add to this the significant fact that during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century—precisely when the literature of the *exempla* reached its greatest bloom—the Netherlands were the wealthiest

country north of the Alps, that in the fifteenth century they had a Renaissance all of their own, with the rise of Mysticism and the first school of Flemish painters, and the book will be found to supply a genuine need.

Considering the vastness of the subject—the total number of *exempla* amounts to more than a thousand—the author has limited the scope of his enquiry by including in the main the edifying *exempla* (*stichtelike exempelen*), i. e. the genre referred to by French writers as *contes pieux*. After a survey of the chief collections, from the *Vitae patrum* to Jacobus de Voragine, he gives a good summary of the nature of the *exempla* and their rise, development and diffusion. He rightly emphasizes the prevalence of oral transmission, which frankly puts this form of narrative in the category of popular tales and would justify, in most cases, an application of the geographical method as inaugurated by the Finnish school of folklorists. In the following chapters he treats in succession the respective rôles, in the *exempla*, of our Lady, Christ, the Devil, the Jews, the Holy Sacrament, Confession, and *de Vier Utersten* (as the Middle Dutch *exempla* call them), i. e. the four last things. In three more chapters he discusses the rôle of the allegory, the influence of Mysticism and the novelistic *exempla* (*moraliserende exempelen*), i. e. stories such as are found in the *Gesta Romanorum*, the chess-book of Jacobus da Cessone, the *Dialogus Creaturarum*, etc. In a concluding chapter he surveys the vicissitudes of this form of literature in Renaissance and post-Renaissance times.

The chief value of the work lies probably in the numerous quotations of Middle Dutch texts, mostly unedited and which the author has copied, with no mean amount of pains, from the MS. materials of Dutch, Belgian and North German libraries. The treatment, though very sympathetic and quite charming in form, does not adduce many new facts. There again the chief value of the book is probably its successful attempt to bring together data which have so far been scattered in learned periodicals and various histories of literature.

The numerous survivals from heathendom, still noticeable in many such tales (ordeal of the bier, extinguishing fire by magic) are somewhat cursorily treated, and one would often like to know whether we are dealing with pieces of the Old Frankish religion or with migratory legends of Mediterranean origin. On the other hand, the author frankly recognizes in the saints' cult a continuation of the hero worship of antiquity (p. 59) and the generally conciliatory policy of the Church, bent on modifying rather than destroying pagan cults, a policy which has often been denied by modern scholars, ardent admirers of the Roman Church though they were. The sexualism at the base of Mariolatry is hinted at

(p. 68). The rôle of the Devil as an object of pity, eager to be re-admitted to Heaven, is mentioned without explanation (p. 164). The strange conception is probably due to the infiltration of Eastern sects, the so-called Devil-Worshippers.¹ The Devil as a rider on a black horse, inducing a man to mount after him and leaping with him into the water (p. 171) is but the christian form of a wide-spread tale, where a nix assumes the shape of the fatal horse.² A classical example of the man ready to deny God but unwilling to deny the Virgin is found in the *chanson de geste Gormond et Isembard*.

It is somewhat to be regretted that the bibliographies are not as a rule brought up to date. I shall therefore give a few supplementary notes, without aiming at completeness. *The Young Man betrothed to Our Lady* (p. 85), cf. P. F. Baum, *P. M. L. A.*, xxxiv (1919), p. 523; G. Huet, *Revue Hist. Rel.*, 1913, p. 193. Soul in plant (p. 91), cf. Bolte-Polívka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, I, 262; *P. M. L. A.*, xxxviii (1923), p. 457; *Arch. Rom.*, vi, 376. *Dons merveilleux* (p. 96), cf. E. Cosquin, *Rev. trad. pop.* xxviii (1913), p. 347. *La légende du page de sainte Elisabeth* (p. 122), cf. Cosquin, *Etudes folkloriques* (1922), p. 73. Crescentia (p. 124), cf. A. Wallensköld, *Le Conte de la femme chaste convoitée par son beau-frère*, Helsingfors, 1907. The Devil as loyal servant (p. 165), cf. A. Wesselski, *Marchen des Mittelalters* (1925), p. 242. Raven crying *cras* (p. 287), cf. J. Klapper, *Erzählungen des Mittelalters* (1914), p. 25; 235.

Taken as a whole, the work is a useful contribution to the history of mediaeval literature and of considerable value to the student of the *conte pieux*.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

A Study of the Middle English Poem Known as the Southern Passion. By BEATRICE DAW BROWN. Oxford, 1926. 111 pp.

This monograph, the first four chapters of which were written as a Byrn Mawr dissertation, presents an important study of the *Southern Passion*, a religious poem hitherto unprinted. Dr. Brown's work will serve as introduction to the Early English Text

¹ On this curious sect cf. A. v. Haxthausen, *Transkaukasien*, Leipzig, 1856, pp. 221 ff.; René Dussaud, *Histoire et religion des Nosairis*, Paris, 1900, *passim*; Isya Joseph, *Devil Worship*, Boston, s. d., *passim*.

² J. W. Wolf, *Niederländische Sagen*, Leipzig, 1843, pp. 62; 314; Powell-Magnússon, *Icelandic Legends*, London, 1864-66, I, 106 ff.; W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, London, 1896, I, 44.

Society edition of the poem which is at present in process of publication.

The author discusses in five chapters all the important problems in connection with her text, including MSS., provenience and dialect, sources, and authorship. Chapter I,¹ which is introductory, describes the poem in general terms. In its complete form the *Southern Passion* contains some 2250 lines dealing with the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ. It is included whole or in part in almost all the manuscripts of the *South English Legendary*, with which, for stylistic reasons as well, it may be identified.² Internal evidence dates the *terminus ad quem* of the *Passion* at 1290; the anterior limit is set by that of the *Legendary* at 1272. The contents of the poem offer a close rendering of gospel and sometimes apocryphal material, skilfully woven into a continuous, restrained narrative, conspicuous for its lack of the legendary expansion found, for example, in the *Northern Passion*. Chapter II deals with the extant MSS. of the *South English Legendary* in which the *Passion* is included. The MSS. are first described in detail and then discussed in their relationship to one another. The whole complicated relationship within and between the two groups into which she divides them is made clear by line for line comparisons of the texts and by a series of diagrams.

The problem of the provenience of the poem is inevitably approached through that of the *Legendary*. Dr. Brown attacks the assumption previously held that the *Legendary* was compiled at the Abbey of Gloucester. To support her attack she cites actual allusions in the *Legends* which seem to point to Somersetshire as their back-ground. Her study of the language of the MSS. of the *Passion* supports still further her claim for a south-western origin of the *Legendary*. She offers an analysis of the dialect of the several MSS., wherever possible comparing the *Passion* text to documents of established provenience. The purpose of the study is "to establish the character of each text as prevaillingly Southern or Midland" (p. 35), and to show "the type of modification undergone in the course of a century and a half by an originally South-western text" (p. 36).

The most important sources of the *Southern Passion* were the Vulgate and the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor. The Vulgate supplied not only the substance but for the most part the phrasing of the parts of the *Passion* devoted to the life of Jesus. The *Historia Scholastica* probably gave to the *Passion* its narrative

¹ The title of Chapter I, "*The Southern Passion in its relation to the South English Legendary*," is slightly misleading. As will be seen, the chapter includes all the material necessary for the understanding of the more specialized study brought forward in Chapters II to V.

² The only complete edition of the *South English Legendary* is edited by Horstmann, *H. E. T. S.*, vol. 87. However, the MS. here published (Harley 2277) is one of the few which does not include the *Southern Passion*.

structure and the bulk of its expository material. Other twelfth-century authorities which may have been used are Hugo of St. Victor, Abbé Robert of Tuy, and Bernard of Clairvaux. Dr. Brown finds no influence of the liturgy but occasional reflections of ritual and of the language of the service book. An interesting conjecture is that the evidences of fear described in the poem on the part of the Maries at the Tomb are a poetic rendering of the rubric instructions for the Maries in the liturgical Easter play. The chapter on sources is closed with a detailed discussion of the resemblances—chiefly emotional in character—between the *Passion* and both the *Meditationes Vitae Christi* and the *Lignum Vitae*. The whole chapter offers an interesting study of the process—to use Dr. Brown's own words—"through which the spirit and substance of medieval theology were transferred into the popular literature of devotion" (p. 52).

Chapter V propounds an important new theory of authorship for the *South English Legendary*, which hitherto has been considered an anonymous work. After considering the general tone and purpose of the collection, Dr. Brown with some degree of certainty assigns its authorship to the Dominican Friars, rather than to the usually accepted monastic house. The important points of her proof are: (1) an audience of actual listeners is repeatedly recognized in the poem, an audience which is regarded as unlettered; (2) there is no historical evidence to show that the thirteenth-century monasteries were zealous for the spiritual needs of their parishioners; (3) the pieces in the *Legendary* are unsuited to use in the appointed services of the Church; (4) the *Legendary* constantly exhibits an attitude toward the church and social order which is historically attributed to the friars and which in many cases is reflected in works of authentic friar authorship; (5) active sympathy with the friars is again and again shown; (6) the attitude toward women and the knowledge shown of the details of ordinary life are impossible for a monk. The *Legendary* is further assigned to a Dominican rather than a Franciscan friar because of the exaltation in the poem of the figure of St. Dominic. Finally, attention is drawn to the fact that the author of the great corresponding collection, the *Legenda Aurea*, was Jacobus de Voragine, a Dominican.

Dr. Brown has conducted her investigation with thoroughness and with a sympathy for her material which makes her monograph excellent reading. She is careful to qualify her general statements (see for example pages 33, 62, and 89), and her conclusions are drawn only from adequate evidence. Moreover, even the brief quotations from the text of the *Passion*³ serve to justify her claims

³ At no point does Mrs. Brown make clear from which MS she quotes her extracts from the *Passion*. One supposes that this point will be unnoticed when the text itself is published. However, in this separate study one would be glad to have the source of the quotations indicated.

for the intrinsic value of the poem apart from its interest as a literary problem. In fine, the medievalist can look forward with pleasure to the publication of the text of the *Southern Passion*, to which Dr. Brown's study furnishes so happy an introduction.

Bryn Mawr College.

MILLICENT CAREY.

Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642. OLA ELIZABETH WINSLOW. University of Chicago dissertation. Privately printed, 1926. 186 pp.

In her dissertation Miss Winslow has presented the results of a painstaking study of low comedy elements in medieval and Elizabethan drama in an attempt to set forth the structural relation of this comic matter to the drama. Her work shows care and untiring industry, but her conclusions are neither clear, concise, nor convincing. At one moment, Miss Winslow seems to argue for steady development in the technique of low comedy; at the next, the preponderance of evidence forces her to doubt the progress of development. Miss Winslow would have been happier in a title if she had elected to call her treatise *Functions of Low Comedy in the Drama before 1642*. She has collected and presented a mass of material illustrative of the use of low comedy, but she does not draw any conclusions which are sufficiently convincing. Perhaps this is owing to the fact that the material is frequently contradictory.

To conclude that manipulation of plot situations in moralities by low comedy characters resulted in the conscious development of a low comedy technique to that end seems to be pushing a theory too far. Likewise Miss Winslow's attempt to prove that low comedy was often consciously used to serve as a time element is weak. To be sure, clownery was sometimes used for this purpose, but to formulate a definite technique is hazardous conjecture. The numerous complaints of the dramatists against the public appetite for low comedy indicate that buffoonery was necessary to popular favor; few dramatists took the pains to make their clownery essentially functional.

The statement (p. 105) that protests against low comedy presented the academic view is hardly accurate. Marlowe, Jonson, and later even Heywood, to mention only a few, protest as practical dramatists against an overburden of clownage.

To quibble with Miss Winslow over her interpretation of certain scenes would be futile, since such interpretation must neces-

sarily be subjective; yet I cannot accept many of her statements. To say that the entire comic technique of *Misogonus* (p. 88) is closely knit seems to me to misread the play. Nor can I see that Launce's scene with his dog (p. 119) in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* consciously burlesques, even slightly, the main love-plot. Likewise, I cannot believe that Autolycus had any contemporary relation to the structure of *The Winter's Tale*, aside from that of extraneous entertainment.

Miss Winslow attempts to make a point that after Shakespeare the social status of low comedy characters was raised for comic effect. She points out (p. 140) in illustration that Sir Gyles Goosecappe is funnier because he has a title, but she forgets that the earlier Falstaff was Sir John, and Lyly's Tophas was Sir Tophas, not to mention the social position of Pilate and Herod.

Miss Winslow loses the contemporary point of view in protesting against the impropriety of Greene's representing "a Queen as taking pleasure in the drunken sportings of Adam in *A Looking Glass for London and England*" (p. 100). Not only drunkenness, but insanity was comic, and Elizabethan women were not too squeamish to be amused even by mad-house antics.

The omission of all consideration of the striking low comedy matter in *Fulgens and Lucrez* is a serious error in a treatise which attempts a complete discussion of the subject. Certainly such an important play at the beginning of the secular drama should not be overlooked.

Perhaps more careful proof-reading would have prevented such errors as Quiller-Couch for Quiller-Couch on p. 109. It seems not too much to ask also that a work designed as a scholarly contribution have an index.

Probably Miss Winslow attempts the impossible in her effort to arrive at a definite structural technique in so amorphous a mass as Elizabethan low comedy. She has presented some valuable and suggestive material for the further study of this portion of the early drama.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen. FRANZISKA FÜLLER. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1924. 96 pp.

It is a pleasure to review this booklet which, in limited compass, contains a profound analysis of the portrayal of women characters in Kleist's dramas and prose narratives. Perhaps only a woman

with genuinely refined insight into Kleist's conception of love as it is mirrored in women like Agnes, Alkmene, Eve, Penthesilea, Kathchen, die Marquise von O. . . and Natalie could write so searching and convincing a treatise on this difficult theme. Her investigation is free from the extravagances of interpretation that have marked various attempts at setting forth Kleist's attitude toward the women who played a part in his life and those who figure in his works. The author is well acquainted with literature on Kleist, and, without indulging in polemics against other critics, takes issue with some of them in a concise and discriminating presentation. Her book contains a judicious selection of significant quotations from Kleist's letters that reflect his views on woman, on love and the relation of man to woman. Such passages are set forth carefully as a background for an understanding of the women in Kleist's works.

The author's ability to state valid conclusions in trenchant fashion stands out in a sentence like the following: "Kleist ist keine philosophisch-spekulativ gerichtete Natur, und so sehr er sich auch bemüht, die Dinge mit dem Verstande zu erfassen, der Urgrund seines Wesens ist Gefühl, seine "seltsam gespannte, ewig unruhig bewegte Seele" konnte sich daher aus den Wirrnissen, in die sie die Philosophie gestossen hatte, nur retten durch die Versenkung in das ihr ureigenste Gebiet: die Poesie" (p. 17). An occasional summary statement requires more adequate development to make it entirely convincing or to bring out its full significance. This is true of the following conclusion: "Dass 'Erdbeben von Chile' ist die Novelle, in der Kleist so recht eigentlich seine Weltanschauung zur Darstellung bringt" (p. 27). In view of the careful proofreading it is somewhat surprising to find Jeronimus in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* referred to repeatedly as Jeronismus (p. 19-20).

The author has not merely published one of the sanest treatises that has yet appeared on this much-discussed subject but has written with refinement of thought and diction. Moreover, her investigation is marked by keen insight into Kleist's personality and character.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL.

Ohio Wesleyan University.

Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. By EUNICE RATHBONE GODDARD. The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. VII. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press; Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1927. Pp. 263.

This study contrasts pleasantly with the many doctoral dissertations that express a will to earn a Ph. D. degree and little else, for here is a dissertation that is both competent and useful—a really valuable contribution to Old French lexicography. The author modestly says (p. 4) that “it is in regard to accuracy of statement and completeness of documentation rather than in novelty of conclusions that the present work represents progress.” Those, however, who in struggling with the problems of mediæval costume have turned impatiently from dictionaries like Godefroy’s to archæological handbooks like Quicherat’s or Enlart’s—and back again—will find that this statement underrates the merits of the book. By correlating the literary and archæological data available in connection with the various terms discussed, by presenting the results in the form of a glossary and by citing in most instances a larger number of examples than can be found collected elsewhere, Miss Goddard has given us a volume that is original in method, conveniently arranged and, within the limits it sets itself, well-nigh exhaustive.

A summarizing Introduction describes the chief articles of dress worn on various occasions by women of different ages and stations, and indicates the principal changes introduced during the period under consideration. We also learn incidentally that France even at this early time was the arbiter of women’s fashions, that Chrétien de Troyes and Benoît de Saint More were accurate connoisseurs of the couturière’s art and that the romances in general, written primarily for women, were “the *Vogue* and *Vanity Fair* of the Middle Ages” (p. 6). The Glossary that follows lists one by one the different terms connected with the subject, citing pertinent literary allusions in full, referring to the iconographical evidence available and discussing previous definitions in the light of the large body of material—much of it new—thus assembled. Seven plates containing illustrations from the sculpture and manuscripts of the period, four systematic bibliographies and an index add materially to the book’s usefulness. It is much to be hoped that Miss Goddard, with her excellent preparation for the task, will continue her researches and publish similar glossaries for the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. It is also to be hoped, however, that she will not find it necessary to publish the succeeding volumes abroad. Anyone who has seen an English book through a foreign press will

know how to condone the typographical errors in this study, but it is none the less distressing that so admirable a work should be marred in this way.

GRACE FRANK.

Bryn Mawr College.

Victor Hugo. *The Man and the Poet.* By WILLIAM F. GIESE.
The Dial Press. New York, 1926.

Professor Giese is not the first to label Victor Hugo *Jocrisse à Patmos*, but I know of no other demonstration as thorough and complete of the essential truth of the jibe. His book is a severe indictment not only of V. Hugo but of many tendencies in romantic poetry and its varied progeny. As such it may well be irritating to Hugolators and to champions of red bonneted liberty in literature, but it is too charged with thought to be lightly brushed aside. Hugo's works and work are weighed in many balances and invariably real genius is found wanting. His entire output is deeply permeated with his personality and the key note of both his life and writing is vanity. He professes and perhaps believes himself to be a prophet and philanthropist, but serried analysis reveals him as a constant practitioner of art for art's sake. His master faculty, which he assiduously cultivated, is tyranny over words and these he proclaims in their turn sovereign over ideas. He possesses to a magnificent and perhaps unparalleled degree visual imagination and a power of evocation of form and color which makes of him a great descriptive poet, but he lacked the insight of a great nature poet. His imagination is dehumanized; it is that of an unbridled barbarian. He draws his inspiration not from real imagination but from irresponsible fancy. His splendid descriptions exist for their own glitter without ulterior significance and without blending of ornamental detail into harmony of the whole. He has a profound contempt for rationality, consistency and good taste. He mistakes bombastic rhetoric for sublime thought and so mingles the grotesque and the heroic as to give birth to a new chaos. Thus lack of all restraint and taste, and especially of the architectonic faculty, doom him to failure as an epic poet, as his inability to distinguish coarse vituperation from thoughtful satire ruin his polemic. Those who seek in poetry only virtuosity will find full satisfaction in his work, but whose asks depth of feeling and thought, in a word, *criticism of life*, will repeat with Horace: *Montes pariantur, nascitur ridiculus mus.*

I have dwelt on the destructive side of Professor Giese's book for it is the predominant note. His strictures are amply illustrated

and justified by quotation on almost every page, but he has studied Hugo too thoroughly to be oblivious of occasional flashes of true genius which receive notice as they occur. His complaint is that he finds only a modicum of bread to an intolerable deal of ale. He writes brilliantly, enlivening his annihilating judgments with the rapier thrusts of wit which those who know his work expect from him.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

Reed College.

An Anthology of Seventeenth Century French Literature. By P. CHAPMAN, L. CONS, L. LEVENGOOD, W. VREELAND. Princeton University Press, 1927.

It is refreshing, among so many French text-books and anthologies published in this country, to come across one at least which, without any luxurious array of classification, footnotes, and notices, biographical and other, offers a felicitous combination of good taste and thorough scholarship. The extracts in this volume have been very carefully selected; the text given is always the best available. The proportions are harmonious and the relative importance of every writer comes out clearly. The minor names are not neglected: Scarron, Cardinal de Retz, Tallemant des Réaux, etc. The essential of Descartes is given here, the first *Provinciale* of Pascal, some of the most important letters of the century, and generally speaking such extracts as will spare the student the discouraging feeling of getting lost in long and difficult volumes, while there is enough to provide the spur that will lead to the complete works later on. Lastly the order adopted is the simplest, that is to say the best: the chronological one.

The reviewer of an anthology usually cannot refrain from telling his readers what he would have done if he had compiled it himself and bothers them with a long list of names and titles that he would like to add or to erase. The drama has been purposely omitted here, and wisely in our opinion. Yet one may ask whether fragments of Corneille's *Discours* or of Racine's prefaces, might not have proved useful. Maynard and Saint-Amant would not have been unworthy of a place, however scant, among 17th century poets—and the complete omission of those two independent and original writers, Saint-Everemond and Fontenelle, is perhaps the one we should personally most regret. But the book has 400 pages already and, on looking once more at its contents, we find nothing that we should wish to disappear. The limitation of space must cause a keen pang indeed to compilers of anthologies! The material presentation of the

volume also deserves high praise. It is to be hoped that the book will meet with the success it is entitled to, not only in university circles but with the general public, at a time when a renewal of interest in French classical literature has been lately conspicuous in England and America.

HENRI PEYRE.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Borgarthing Law of the Codex Tunbergensis. By GEORGE T. FLÖM. [University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, x, 4]. 1925.

This diplomatic text-edition represents a continuation of Professor Flöm's valuable studies in Old Norwegian manuscripts. The *Codex Tunbergensis* is a manuscript of this category containing various laws of the *Borgarþing* in southeastern Norway. Flöm secured photographs of parts of it for the University of Illinois and the present edition is based upon these photographs. The edition reproduces in diplomatic print, page for page, leaves 14a to 91a from the whole manuscript of 186 leaves (the leaf-numbering does not agree with that in other descriptions, but is that of Flöm's photographic facsimile). These leaves contain the national Norwegian law (*landslov*) of King Magnús Hákonsson (reigned 1263-80, known as *lagabæti*, "lawmender") as applying to the *Borgarþing* (adopted 1276). Though the manuscript has not hitherto been given separate publication, full account of its readings was of course furnished in the general publication of King Magnús' law of 1274-76 in *Norges gamle Love*, II (ed. Keyser and Munch), 7 ff. 1848. Flöm adds in his introduction and notes various descriptive details which the printing could not reproduce. It is perhaps petty to call attention to carelessness in minor points, but in a cursory survey the following cases struck my attention: *Scandinavianist* (p. 9) is, if not impossible, certainly undesirable as an English word (avoided on p. 5 in the same environment). The word *bistave* (p. 14 and elsewhere, also printed *bi-stave*) is quite impossible and would even be unintelligible to one not familiar with its Scandinavian original. On the other hand in speaking of the division of words at the end of lines (p. 11) the division of *ski-pat* is referred to as apparently accidentally coinciding with the syllabic division. As a matter of fact it does not, the Old Norse syllabic division having been *skip-at*.

A. LE ROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

FEBRUARY, 1928

Number 2

THE RELATIONS OF LUDWIG TIECK AND K. G. CARUS

(With four unpublished letters.)

Though the nineteenth century was not an era of intense specialization, it would be difficult to find in its annals a more notable example of a versatile genius and polymath than Karl Gustav Carus. Born in 1789 at Leipzig, he had already practiced and professed medicine there when in 1814 he was appointed professor of obstetrics in Dresden. In 1827 he became the personal physician of the King of Saxony. He wrote numerous works on many phases of anatomy, physiology, gynecology and craniology. But he was also an artist of some ability and besides *Briefe über die Landschaftsmalerei* (Leipzig, 1831) has left several creditable oil paintings. In addition, he was a psychologist of standing and the author of *Vorlesungen über Psychologie* (Leipzig, 1831), *Psyche, zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Seele* (Pforzheim, 1846), *Über Lebensmagnetismus* (Leipzig, 1857) and *Natur und Idee* (Vienna, 1861). To students of literature, however, he is best known as a friend of Goethe and an early Goethe scholar. His three books *Briefe über Goethes Faust* (1835), *Goethe, zu dessen näherem Verständnis* (1843), and his more ambitious biography (1863), as well as his *Festrede* delivered at Dresden in 1849, while not read any more to-day, will always retain their value as source material.

When Tieck settled in Dresden during the summer of 1819. Carus was already a resident of five years' standing. The two men soon met and in time became close friends. Both Köpke in his biography of Tieck (II, 63) and Friesen in his reminiscences (I, 13) speak of Carus as a member of Tieck's intimate circle. Carus himself in his four volumes of *Lebenserinnerungen und Denkwürdigkeiten* (Leipzig, 1865-1866) has words of sincere praise

for Tieck. Evidence of Tieck's high regard for Carus, whose personality the severe critic Raumer once calls "lovable,"¹ is found occasionally in Tieck's correspondence with Raumer. Undoubtedly they saw a good deal of one another and constantly exchanged not only opinions on many subjects, but also tokens of mutual affection. In reporting to Raumer on the celebration of her father's sixtieth birthday on May 31, 1833, Dorothea writes on June 3:

Den Morgen ganz früh bekam Vater ein eignes Gemälde und Gedicht von Carus, letzteres finde ich recht schön, nur war er betrübt daß der arme Carus krank lag und nicht selbst kommen konnte, dies verdarb uns sehr die Freude, denn er gehört gewiß zu denen die Vater wahrhaft verehren und lieben, darum that es uns leid, daß er gerade an diesem Tage fehlen mußte.²

When Tieck left Dresden for Berlin in 1812 these pleasant relations were continued as far as possible by correspondence. However, of the many letters which must have passed between Carus and Tieck, there have been published only the six to Tieck which Holtei gives in his *Briefe an Tieck* (I, 123-129). The first of these letters, undated, is probably from the year 1840. A promise to call on Tieck in the near future clearly shows that it was written prior to Tieck's long visit to Potsdam in 1841. Carus asks Tieck to return a volume of his *Physiologie*, which had appeared in that year, and requests a copy of *Urania* for 1841 (published in 1840) containing Tieck's novelle *Waldeinsamkeit*. He reminds Tieck also of a manuscript on Dante loaned to him apparently through Carus by Prince Johann, the president of the Dante-Gesellschaft.

In the second letter, dated April 4, 1843—Tieck was now established in Berlin—Carus expresses the joy of his whole family in having received a letter "von unserm theuren Tieck," who is just recuperating from an illness. Carus goes on to criticize severely a drama of Raupach, hopes that Tieck will soon be able to resume writing (Wir schmachten oft danach wieder einmal etwas von Ihnen zu lesen), mentions the illness of their mutual Dresden friend, Frau von Lüttichau and promises finally to complete his

¹ *Literarischer Nachlass*, II, Berlin, 1809, p. 168.

² Zeydel, "An unpublished Letter of Dorothea Tieck," *Germania Review*, II, 1 (January, 1927), p. 12. Cf. also *Erinnerungen an Friedrich von Uechtritz*, Leipzig, 1884, 156-228.

Goethe in a few weeks. On July 26 he sends Tieck the book, with the remark that through Alexander von Humboldt he has dedicated a copy to Frederick William IV of Prussia. He assures Tieck that he makes solicitous inquiries of every visitor from Berlin concerning Tieck's health, and reports that Frau von Lüttichau's condition is much improved. He announces that he is at work upon a new book on psychology, perhaps *Psyche*, writes of the death of Rumohr, and mentions the impending presentation of *Medea*, which was being arranged by Tieck in Berlin at the king's request.

The next letter was written on May 21, 1844, just before Carus's departure upon a trip to England, and is intended as a congratulatory note for Tieck on his seventy-first birthday. With it Carus sends a copy of his most recent work, of which he says: "Manches davon ist Ihnen von früherher bekannt, und andres sehnt sich Ihnen bekannt zu werden."

On April 15, 1845, Carus introduces to Tieck by letter a young man whose name is von Gar, a resident of Florence and the editor of an Italian historical periodical. He had formerly been private secretary to the Empress of Austria and expects to become chief librarian to the Grand Duke of Florence. Carus then expresses his happiness over the news of Tieck's improved health and rejoices that he has resumed his recitals and his preparations for the staging of Aeschylus. He mentions the possibility of a visit to Berlin in the course of the year.

The last letter in Holtei's collection, of November 26, 1847, is a note of condolence on the death of Tieck's beloved friend, Countess Finkenstein, who had made her home with Tieck for many years. All six letters are couched in terms of warm friendship and indicate how close to one another the two men must have been.

Heretofore none of Tieck's letters to Carus have been brought to light. Through a fortunate chance I have recently come into possession of three of them. In addition I have secured a note in the hand of Tieck's wife, Amalie, addressed to Carus. I shall present first the three Tieck letters in chronological order.

The first, bearing Tieck's red initialed paper seal, is a brief note addressed to "Herrn Hofrath Carus, Hochwohlgeb., Allhier," *i. e.* Dresden, and bears the date of receipt: 4, 21, thus antedating the earliest of the Holtei letters by nineteen years. It reads:

Geehrter Freund sehn wir Sie vielleicht heut Abend? Sie werden von H v Humboldt hören, daß er uns das Vergnügen macht, zu uns zu kommen. Wir haben uns lange nicht gesehn. Er ging von mir, um Sie zu besuchen, und es wäre schon, wenn ich die beiden Männer heut in mei. Zimmer sehn konnte. Vielleicht auch die Ihrigen?—Aus der Ferne sah ich Sie neulich im Lear.

Der Ihrige

Sonntag.

TIECK.

Apparently the friendship of Tieck and Carus is here still in an early stage. The Humboldt referred to is probably Wilhelm, whom Tieck had known for many years. He was acquainted also with Alexander, but his relations to him did not become intimate until later.

The second letter bears no direct evidence of its date but also belongs to Tieck's Dresden period. It is written upon his favorite green stationery.

Sie werden mich gewiß nicht mißverstehen, mein innigst geliebter Freund, wenn ich an dem heutigen Tage die Anzahl Ihrer glückwünschenden Freunde nur in Gedanken vermehre. An manchen Tagen fühle ich mich so schwach und unlustig, so furchtsam und feige vor der Luft, daß ich ungern nur ein Zimmer hier mit dem andren vertausche. So ist mir heut: ich bin darum nicht zu H. v. Lüttichau zum Essen gegangen und habe darum in diesen Tagen das Theater und Alles versäumt.

Nehmen Sie aber mit Wohlwollen meine herzlichsten Glückwünsche auf, und erhalten Sie mir Ihre Freundschaft, die zu meinem Glücke und Bewußtsein meiner selbst nothwendig geworden ist.

Ihr

ganz eigner Bruder

Freund Ludwig Tieck.

A peculiarly morbid mental and physical state to which Tieck was frequently subject is confining him to his room, but can not prevent him from penning at least a brief note of congratulation to his friend on his birthday (January 3). The allusion to Herr von Lüttichau, whose wife has already been referred to, makes it unlikely that our letter was written prior to 1825, for in that year Lüttichau assumed his duties as general director of the Dresden Royal Theatre and became affiliated with Tieck.

The third letter is the reply to Carus's fifth letter (of April 15, 1845) in the Holtei collection.

Verehrter Freund,

Herr Dr. Klunys aus Schweden wünscht einige meiner Freunde in Dresden kennen zu lernen, so freut es mich denn, daß ich im Stande bin und es darf, diesen jungen liebenswürdigen Mann an einen so tiefsinnigen

und gelehrten Forscher, Künstler und liebenswürdigen Gelehrten, wie wir gewis wenige im Vaterlande haben, hinweisen zu können.

Ihr lieber Italiäner hat uns Allen außerordentlich gefallen: ich danke Ihnen für den schönen Brief, den mir dieser Besuch verschafft hat.

Herzliche Grüße von mir und der Gräfin Ihrer *ganzen* lieben, theuren, verehrten Familie: vorzüglich Ihrer herrlichen Gattin, die uns beiden immer so viel Liebe erwiesen hat.

Ihr

L. Tieck.

Berlin

den 7. May: 1845.

"Ihr lieber Italiäner" is von Gar. Both Tieck and Carus were intensely interested in Italy and Italian literature. During Tieck's Dresden period both he and Carus regularly attended the meetings of Prince Johann's Dante-Gesellschaft,³ referred to above. "Die Gräfin" is, of course, Countess Finkenstein.

The last letter in the group is one of the very few in Amalie's hand which have come to light. Toward the end of her life Amalie ailed almost continually and had to submit to several operations. She died of dropsy in 1837. Our letter shows that Carus, as the faithful friend of the family, applied all his medical skill in an effort to prolong her life. The letter was probably written between 1834 and 1837 at her husband's behest.

Verehrter Freund!

Schon seit so langer Zeit haben Sie meinethwegen so viel Muhe gehabt, daß ich es nicht länger unterlassen kann, Ihnen, wenigstens in etwas meine Dankbarkeit zu bezeugen, die wirklich so groß ist, da ich täglich empfinde, wie mein Zustand sich verbessert hat, und der Himmel mag nun über mich verfügen, wie es sein Wille ist, so muß es Ihnen auch beruhigend sein, daß ich und die Meinigen⁴ die Ueberzeugung haben, daß es mir⁵ ohne Ihre Hülfe, den Rest meines Lebens nicht so gut ergangen wäre; darum bitte ich Sie mir auch ferner Ihr Wohlwollen, und Beistand zu schenken.

Mit der innigsten Hochachtung

Ihre Ergebene

Amalia Tieck geb. Alberti.

Both the unpracticed hand and the awkward style reveal the untutored *Hausfrau*, who serves as the butt of many a witticism in the letters of the Schlegels and members of their circle.⁷

³ Köpke, *Ludwig Tieck*, II, Leipzig, 1855, p. 63.

⁴ Originally "meinen," with the final "n" stricken out.

⁵ Originally a small initial "m."

⁶ The words "es mir" are written above "ich," which is stricken out.

⁷ See Waitz, *Caroline. Briefe an ihre Geschwister*, I, Leipzig, 1871: Friedrich to Caroline, October 29, 1798, p. 227; Friedrich to Auguste,

After Tieck's death in April, 1853, Carus, true to his interest in cranioscopy, made a scientific examination of Tieck's skull, the results of which he reported to Kopke in a letter. He draws an interesting comparison between the skulls of Tieck and Goethe. An excerpt from this letter is quoted by Kópke (II, 266).

So much for the manifestly close external relations of the two men. It is my conviction that their internal relations were even more important. There is reason to believe, for example, that the psychology of Carus, which Raumer once described, not without Tieck's warm approval, as both informative and stimulating,⁸ has left its imprint upon Tieck's writings. And there is evidence too that Tieck's feeling for colors was decidedly influenced by Carus's practice as a painter.⁹ But the discussion of these questions must be reserved for a future study.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

University of Cincinnati.

SUSANNA FREEMAN CENTLIVRE

Giles Jacob's *Poetical Register* (1718), *The List of the English Dramatic Poets* appended to Whincop's *Scanderberg* (1747)—to be referred to as Whincop,—and the *Life* in her complete works (1761) agree that Mrs. Susanna Centlivre came from Holbeach in Lincolnshire. All three give her maiden name as Freeman. Abel Boyer, however, noting her death, says, "Her Father's Name, if I mistake not, was Rawkins" (*Political State*, xxvi 1723).

Two of her works, heretofore unmentioned, leave no doubt that Mrs. Centlivre was connected with Holbeach. One poem, "From the Country, To Mr. Rowe in Town, M.DCC.XVIII" (*A New Miscellany of Original Poems By the Most Eminent Hands*, 1720), begins:

October, 1798, p. 369; cf. also Caroline's remark, p. 220. See also Walzel, *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, Berlin, 1890: August 10, 1799, p. 426.

⁸ *Literarischer Nachlass*, II, 168; letter of December, 1835.

⁹ See W. Steinert, *Ludwig Tieck und das Farbenempfinden der roman-tischen Dichtung*, Dortmund, 1910. Steinert expressly mentions the fact that Carus's "malerische Praxis" conformed to Tieck's theories.

From a lonesome Old House, near Holbeach Wash-way,
 (The Wash, you must know, is an Arm of the Sea,)
 A poor Wanderer writes. . . .

The second poem, beginning, "Pull on, be loyal, *Holbeach Boys*," "writ on King George's Birth-Day by Mrs Centlivre, and sent to the Rangers while the Bells were ringing at Holbeach in Lincolnshire" (*A Collection of State Songs*, 1716), explains itself.

A very careful search of the parish records at Holbeach gave no instance of the name Rawkins or of a name resembling it, during the period searched, but Freeman appeared frequently. However, no trace of a Susanna Freeman was discovered. Probability is thus added to the supposition that she was born in Ireland during the exile of her father following the Restoration.

In addition to the two poems mentioned, other works to be added to the bibliography of Mrs. Centlivre in the Cambridge History, are:

Letters (under the name of Carroll), in *Familiar and Courtly Letters, written by Monsieur Voiture, with A Collection of Letters of Friendship and other Occasional Letters*, Printed for Sam Briscoe, 1700.

Several of them reprinted, in *The Third Volume of the Works of Mr. Thomas Brown*, 1715.

Several of them reprinted and others added, in *Familiar Letters of Love, Gallantry, and several Occasions, With Mr. Tho. Brown's Remains*, 1718.

Letters, in *Letters of Wit, Politicks and Morality* . . . [edited by Abel Boyer] . . . 1701. This is the volume referred to in Boyer's *Political State*. See the *D. N. B.* under Centlivre.

"A Poem on the Recovery of the Lady Henrietta Hollis from the Small Pox." Unpublished. B. M. MS. Harl. 7649.

A poem, "On the Right Honorable Charles Earl of Halifax being made Knight of Garter" (*The Patriot*, Nov. 18, 1714), printed anonymously as "by a Lady," but see *The Patriot*, Jan. 18, 1715, and Whincop.

A poem, "To her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales. At her Toylet, on New-years Day" (*The Patriot*, Jan. 18, 1715).

A poem, "An Epistle to Mrs. Wallup, now in the Train of Her Royal Highness, the Princess of Wales . . . 1715"

A poem, "Upon the Bells Ringing at St. Martins in the Fields, on St. George's Day, 1716, being the Anniversary of Queen Anne's Coronation" (*The Flying-Post: or The Post-Master*, May 12, 1716; also, *A Collection of State Songs*, 1716).

"A Pastoral to the Honoured Memory of Mr. Rowe" (*Musarum Lachrymae: or, Poems to the Memory of Nicholas Rowe, Esq, By Several*

Hands, 1719; also, *A New Miscellany of Original Poems, Translations, and Imitations*. By the Most Eminent Hands, 1720).

A poem, "To the Duchess of Bolton, Upon seeing her picture drawn unlike her" (*A New Miscellany*, 1720).

A poem, "To the Earl of Warwick, On his Birth-Day" (*Ibid*).

[*Ibid*, two poems to Mrs. Centlivre by Amhurst; also published in *Poems on several Occasions*, By N. Amhurst, 1720.]

A poem, "Letter on the Receipt of a Present of Cyder" (*A Miscellaneous Collection of Poems, Songs and Epigrams*. By several Hands, Published by T. M. Gent, 1721).

A poem, "Letter from Mrs. Centlivre, to Mr. Joy, Deputy-Governour of the South Sea" (*Ibid*; also, separately, 1720).

A letter "to Mr. Read" and a poem (*The Weekly Journal: or British Gazetteer*, Oct. 20, 1722).

A letter "To the Author of the St. James's Journal" (*St. James's Journal*, Nov. 22, 1722).

"A Trip to the Masquerade, or, a Journey to Somerset-House, 1713" (Bodleian Library), which seems to be "The Masquerade. A Poem. Humbly inscribed to his Grace the Duke d'Aumont," advertised in the *Daily Courant*, Sept. 3, 1713, and mentioned by Whincop. No dedication appears, but the poem includes a flattering tribute to d'Aumont.

Another poem, "The Answer of Abelard [Pope's "Heloise to Abelard" precedes it]. By Mrs. Centlivre," in the *Lovers Cabinet*. Dublin, 1755, is to be found, with only a few variations, in *Poems by Eminent Ladies*, London, 1755, where it is given to Mrs. Madan. Later editions of Mrs. Madan's works include it.

JOHN WILSON BOWYER.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

AN IMITATION OF THE FAERIE QUEENE

Anyone interested in Spenser or the virtuosi should look up *A Canto of the Fairy Queen, written by Spenser, never before published* (Bodl. Godw. Pamph. 1668). It is dated 1739, and tells how Archimago persuades the Red-Cross Knight to visit foreign lands where his companions are frequently Sensuality, Pride, and pompous Pedantry. The grandeur that was Rome is described and her present desolation as the play-house for "virtuosi vain and wonder-gaping boys."

WILLIAM HENRY IRVING.

Harvard University.

“WYNTER WAKENETH AL MY CARE”

In MS. Harley 2253, fol. 75 b, is to be found “Wynter wakeneth al my care,” one of the most beautiful of the early English lyrics. It is written in a simple, straightforward style and its vocabulary, save for the line I wish to discuss, presents no difficulties though many other songs in this same MS. cannot be read without frequent reference to a glossary or dictionary. Like many of our finest lyrics, this poem is brief—but fifteen lines. It has more emotion than thought; and when it warns us of the shortness of life, that warning comes from a lover of the good, green earth rather than from a moralist or preacher. The unknown poet had in him more of Herrick than of Jeremy Taylor, if we may anticipate three centuries and a half. The meter of the poem is interesting for each of the three stanzas ends in a long line which produces something of the effect Spenser gained with the Alexandrine in the stanza of *The Faerie Queene*.

Thanks to Boddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen* and to anthologists from Ritson to Quiller-Couch, this poem is fairly well known yet for the sake of the argument I shall quote it, using the punctuation Professor Brown has given it in his *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, p. 10:

Wynter wakeneth al my care,
nou this leues waxeth bare; •
ofte y sike & mourne sare
 when hit cometh in my thoht
 of this worldes ioie hou hit geth al to noht.

Nou hit is & nou hit nys,
also hit ner nere ywys,
that moni mon seith soth hit ys:
 ‘al goth bote godes wille,
 alle we shule deye thah vs like ylle.’

al that gre(i)n me graueth grene
nou hit faleweth al by-dene—
ihesu, help that hit be sene
 ant shild vs from helle,
 for y not whider y shall ne hou longe her duelle.

The only line that is troublesome is the first one of the third

stanza, "al that gren me graueth grene," for the words 'gren' and 'graueth' offer a problem.

J. Ritson, *Ancient Songs from the Time of King Henry the Third to the Revolution.*, London, 1790, p. 34, reads "g^ueth"; the second edition, 1829, p. 65, reads "graueth," as does the third edition, "carefully revised by W. Carew Hazlitt," 1877, p. 56. In not one of these three editions is there an attempt to explain this line, though other lines in the poem are glossed. G. Ellis, *Specimens of the Early English Poets*, 4th edition, 1811, p. 65, changes the reading of this line to "All that grain me groweth green." T. Wright, *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*, 1841, p. 62, and R. P. Wulcker, *Altenglisches Lesebuch*, 1874, I, 107, both follow Ritson's reading of "graueth." K. Bøddeker, *Altenglische Dichtungen*, 1878, p. 195, reads "al that gren me greueth grene," but states in a footnote that the MS. reads "graueth." Bøddeker's edition has a very detailed introduction and an elaborate glossary, yet there is no comment on this line. *The Oxford Book of English Verse*, p. 7, and G. Sampson, *The Cambridge Book of Prose and Verse*, p. 383, print "al that gren me graueth grene"; while Chambers and Sidgwick, *Early English Lyrics*, p. 168, follow Bøddeker and read "greueth." No one of these three books glosses this line; clearly it is a difficult one.

So far as I have observed, but two scholars have discussed its meaning. Wulcker, *op. cit.*, I, 171, offers the following explanation: "al that gren me graueth grene. . . . Ich stelle *graueth* zu Altfr. *graveir*, eine nebenform zu *grever* = *beschweren*, *bedrücken*, *traurig machen*. *grene* aber steht Hav. v. 996 mit der gewöhl. metathese = *gerne* Got. *gairnei*, *verlangen*, *sehnsucht*, *lust*. Noch jetzt haben wir es im Schottischen. *All dieses grüne beschwert meine sehnsucht, stimmt meine lust traurig, denn alles welkt dahin.*" This explanation has not been reprinted in any of the anthologies that include this song.

Professor Brown, *English Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, p. 245, has the following note on this line of the poem and the two lines that succeed it:

The figure appears to be based upon *John* XII, 24, 25. 'Nisi granum frumenti cadens in terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet; si autem mortuum fuerit, multum fructum affert.' Cf. the metrical homily on this text, printed by Horstmann, *Herrig's Archiv*, LXXXI, 83. See also *Pearl*,

I venture to suggest another explanation, believing that the poet of "Wynter wakeneth al my care" based the first three lines of his third stanza not upon *John* but upon what he actually saw. In this passage, *grene* and *faleweth* certainly refer to colour, for what impressed the writer was the tragic change that comes over the appearance of the woods and the meadows. The whole point of his song is that he actually sees, as did Shakespeare, hideous winter confounding the beauty of summer—stripping the branches and turning the green into the sere and yellow leaf. That sight—the death of the season—plunges him into melancholy, for he knows that life itself is as brief as summer and that for man death is as unescapable as winter.

In the MS. that contains this poem, the form "gren"—"al that gren me graueth grene"—is found in this line only; and, apart from this poem, the form "grene" appears twelve times. (Böddeker, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 116, 130, 133, 146, 172, 174, 218, 291.) In one instance it appears twice in the same line: "ase gromyl in grene grene is the grone," p. 146, l. 37. The final e disappeared first in the North, where the spelling of *Cursor Mundi* shows it was silent by 1300. The MS. of "Wynter wakeneth al my care" is generally dated circa 1310, and it is assumed that it was written in Leominster, Hereford. But in the Midlands, final e only began to disappear in Chaucer's time. Cf. R. Jordan, *Handbuch der mitttel-englischen Grammatik. Erster Theil*, § 141. Heidelberg, 1925. The form "gren" possibly may mark a Northern origin for this poem. It must be remembered that MS. Harley 2253 is a veritable anthology, compiled by a lover of verse who collected poems of different authors and periods, poems originating in various parts of England, and that there may be traces of different dialects in the same poem. Thus in another song Böddeker prints, p. 109, "Ne mai no lewed lued libben in londe," we have examples of the Northern and Midland dialects, and Böddeker conjectures that this poem was composed on the borders of Northumbria and the Westmidlands, though it appears in this MS. in the southern dialect. And if, in the song we are considering, the scribe retained the Northern "gren," he retained the final e at the end of the line, "grene," as does Chaucer, giving a feminine ending, which occurs

v, 31: "For vch gresse mot grow of graynez dede." *Grene* and *faleweth* as used here do not refer to colour but to vitality and decay.

in every verse of this stanza. Professor Brown reads "gre(i)n"; but if any letter is to be inserted, I think it should be a final e—"grene."

As for "graueth," it is, as Ellis perceived over a century ago, a variant for "groweth." The N. E. D. lists "grawe" under the various form of "grow." Cf. Jordan, *op. cit.* 105-106. For a discussion of the au-ou spelling, cf. K. Malone, *Modern Philology* xx, 189 ff.

This line should appear then in modern spelling:

All this green me groweth green,

a reading thoroughly in harmony with the mood of the song. Nature has assumed for the poet her garments of green (me groweth), and then at a sudden touch of winter, the leaves fade. The next line laments the sudden change:

nou hit faleweth al by-dene.

It is this tragic contrast that forces from the poet his sudden cry for help and for deliverance from Hell:

ihesu, help that hit be sene
ant shild vs from helle,
for y not whider y shall ne hou longe her duelle.

This is indeed a lengthy discussion of a single line; yet if it sends readers to this lyric, my argument may justify itself.

EDWARD BLISS REED.

New Haven, Conn.

THE SARACEN OATH IN THE *CHANSONS DE GESTE*

It frequently occurs in the *chansons de geste* that a Christian is obliged to make an oath. This is done with the hand placed upon holy relics or upon the Evangel.¹ Much less frequently does a Saracen have to reciprocate with an oath of his own kind. We should expect this to be made solemnly by Mahom, Apollin, or Tervagan, but the mediaeval mind loved analogies. The Saracen

¹ Examples of the oath upon relics are too common to require references. For an oath upon the Evangel cf. *Daurel e Beton*, vv. 27 ff.

was given a Trinity of three gods because of God, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; even so the Saracen, like the Christian, must swear by something tangible. The Christian placed his hand upon saints' bones, the Saracen placed his upon his own tooth! Here are some examples:

Et Karaheus refait sa seurté,
 Haüça son doit, a son dent l'a hurté;
 Puis n'en mentist por les membres copér.
 (*Ogier le Danois*, vv. 1602 ff.).

Mais assez vous querroie miex
 Se vous l'ongle hurtiés au dent.
 (*Jeu de Saint-Nicolas*, vv. 199 ff.).

Sa loi jure, et en a son dent dou doit hurté,
 Que tout metra pour tout, ou ce iert recouvré.
 (*Beuves de Commarçhis*, vv. 829-30).

Por l'otroier fiert son doi a son dant.
 (*Li Monages Renouart*).²

This practice was even parodied in the *Roman de Renart*. In order that they may catch him, the animals persuade Renart to approach the mastiff, Roonel, supposedly dead, that

Sor la dent Roonel gurasse.³

Needless to say, Renart perceives the deceit in time.

Monmerqué and Francisque Michel in their *Théâtre français au moyen âge* refer to this as a "singular usage" and offer no further explanation.⁴ Jeanroy in his recent edition of the *Jeu de Saint-Nicolas* gives a reference to Monmerqué and Michel, but professes ignorance of the origins of this peculiar oath.⁵ I have sought elsewhere for enlightenment with no better results.

In every case that I have observed, with exception of the parody, the oath is taken by a so called Saracen, that is, a pagan. To be sure the mediaeval Frenchman confounded everything that was

² This text has been quoted from Monmerqué-Michel, *Théâtre français au moyen âge*, Paris, 1839, 167 note. It is there cited from the MS.

³ Ed. Ernest Martin, Strasbourg, 1882, II, 284.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ *Classiques français du moyen âge* (no. 48), Paris, 1925, 81.

not Christian and called it Saracen. While talking of the Norsemen Wace mentions the ruin caused by this "gent Sarazine."⁶ Old Roman architecture is referred to constantly as Saracen.⁷ This confusion is well known and requires no further elucidation. Starting with this assumption, I first sought an explanation for the oath upon a tooth in some surviving pagan practice among the Celtic peoples. In the Irish *Acallamh na Senorach* there are frequent instances of Find's obtaining revelation by placing his thumb under a tooth of wisdom;⁸ in the *Covr Anmann* the man Ailill O-lomm is poisoned by venom which enters through his tooth from a poisonous dart.⁹ But to connect the tooth which is possessed of prophecy and the tooth which is an entrance to the brain with an oath, pagan or otherwise, would require considerable ingenuity. The commonest oath among the pagan Irish, to judge from its frequent survival in the sagas, appears to have been the *tongu do dha toinges mo thúath*, "I swear by the god by whom my people swear."¹⁰ O'Curry states that they often swore at a grave; and as in Christian times, they may have sworn three times successively, first standing, then sitting, and then lying.¹¹ The Norse pagans made oath upon a sacred bracelet¹² or upon a sacrificial horse,¹³ etc.

I accordingly turned my search towards the Orient and the genuine Saracens, assuming that the Crusaders had observed some Moslem practice, in the Holy Land or in Spain, confusing it with their own system of swearing upon something tangible. There is a good example of the Saracen type of oath in the *Mémoires* of Joinville.¹⁴ The emirs swear that if they break their covenant

⁶ En plusurs lieux pert la ruine

Que firent la gent Sarazine, (Brut, 422-423).

⁷ L. Olschki, *Paris, nach den altfranzösischen Epen*, Heidelberg, 1913, 46 ff.

⁸ *Irish Teate*, Leipzig, 1900, iv (part 1), lines 11, 203, 1414, 1835, 2408, 2607, 2662, 5416, 6627.

⁹ *Irish teate*, III, p. 306.

¹⁰ Cf. *Tám Bó Cuailnge*, ed. Strachan and O'Keefe, Dublin, 1912 (supplement to *Eriu*), lines 651-652, 704, etc.; and elsewhere.

¹¹ *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, Dublin, 1873, I, cclxxxix.

¹² *Chronicon Saxonum*, ed. Gibson, Oxford, 1692, 83.

¹³ *Scriptores rerum Danicarum mediæ ævi*, ed. J. Langebek, Copenhagen, 1772-1834, cf. *Index* (1878).

¹⁴ Book II, ch. 56.

may they be as a man who goes uncovered to Mecca, as a man who divorces his wife and who takes her again, or as a man who eats swine flesh. In harmony with such oaths as these I shall quote an authorized statement of Professor Enno Littmann of Tübingen, who speaks Arabic and who has lived in the Orient, concerning the modern Arab's oath.

It is not unusual for an Arab to swear "May I be that (placing his thumb under the end of an upper front tooth, withdrawing it quickly and extending his hand), if I do not keep my promise." By "that" he means "utterly destroyed."¹⁵

Since oaths of the type "May so and so happen to me if I break it" were in common use at the time of the Crusades, unquestionably we need look no further. The Frenchman seeing the finger against the tooth, and seldom understanding any of the words, considered the oath as taken on the tooth.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

University of North Carolina.

ENGLISH ADAPTATIONS OF FRENCH DRAMA BETWEEN 1780 AND 1815

Adaptations of French drama on the English stage at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century have been curiously overlooked by students of English drama. This neglect is probably due to the fact that the German influence on English drama during this period has quite overshadowed other possible foreign influences. The following list of plays, therefore, based in part upon stage records¹ and in part upon a comparison of English and French texts, may prove useful as an indication of the wide extent of the English adaptations from the French during these years.

¹⁵ This was secured for me through the courtesy of Professor Lancaster.

¹ Genest, *History of the Drama and Stage in England from 1660 to 1830*, Bath, 1832; Oulton, *The History of the Theatres in London, 1771-1795*, London, 1796, *The History of the Theatres in London, 1795-1817*, London, 1818.

<i>Date</i>	<i>English Play</i>	<i>French Original</i>
Nov 22, 1780 ^a O'Connell	<i>Generous Imposter</i>	(Destouches, <i>Dissipateur</i>)
Dec 27, 1780 Burgoyne	<i>Lord of the Manor</i>	(Marmontel, <i>Silvain</i>)
Apr. 18, 1781	<i>Darnaby Brittle</i> ³	(Molière, <i>George Dandin</i>)
July 3, 1782 Dibdin	<i>None So Blind</i>	(<i>L'Aveugle Prétendu</i>)
Dec. 31, 1782 Mis Brooke	<i>Rosina</i>	(French opera, <i>The Reapers</i>)
Dec 6, 1783 Mrs Cowley	<i>More Ways Than One</i>	(Molière, <i>L'École des Femmes</i>) ⁴
Dec. 14, 1794 Holcroft	<i>Follies of a Day</i>	(Deaumarchais, <i>Figaro</i>)
June 20, 1786 Mis Inchbald	<i>Widow's Vow</i>	(Patrat, <i>L'Heureuse Erreur</i>)
Oct. 16, 1786 MacNally	<i>Richard Cœur de Lion</i>	(Sedaine, <i>Cœur de Lion</i>)
Oct. 24, 1786 Burgoyne	<i>Richard Cœur de Lion</i>	(Sedaine, <i>Cœur de Lion</i>)
Dec 21, 1786 Reynolds	<i>Eloisa</i>	(Rousseau, <i>La Nouvelle Eloise</i>)
Mar 12, 1787 Holcroft	<i>Seduction</i>	(Danclos, <i>Liaisons Dangereuses</i>)
May 22, 1787 Inchbald	<i>Midnight Hour</i>	(Damanian, <i>Guerre Ouerite</i>)
Aug 17, 1787 Robinson	<i>Test of Love</i>	(French translation)
Aug. 28, 1787 Macready	<i>Village Lawyer</i>	(<i>Patelin</i>)
Aug. 22, 1788 Robson	<i>Look Before You Leap</i>	(Florian, <i>La Bonne Mère</i>)
? 1788 Inchbald	<i>Animal Magnetism</i>	(French farce)
Nov. 28, 1788 Inchbald	<i>Child of Nature</i>	(Mme de Genlis, <i>Zélie</i>)
Apr. 20, 1789 Conway	<i>False Appearances</i>	(Boissey, <i>Dehors Trompeurs</i>)
July 15, 1789 Inchbald	<i>Married Man</i>	(Destouches, <i>Philosophe Marié</i>)
Dec. 5, 1789 MacKenzie	<i>Force of Fashion</i>	(French translation)
May 5, 1790 Starke	<i>Widow of Malebar</i>	(Lemierre, <i>Veuve du Malabar</i>)
Feb. 4, 1791 Holcroft	<i>School for Arrogance</i>	(Destouches, <i>Le Glorieux</i>)
May 10, 1791 Inchbald	<i>Hue and Cry</i>	(French Comedy)
July 9, 1791 Inchbald	<i>Next Door Neighbors</i>	(Destouches, <i>Dissipateur</i>)
Apr. 16, 1792 Simons	<i>Village Coquette</i>	(<i>L'Indigent</i>)
Apr. 18, 1792 Parsons	<i>Intrigues of Morning</i>	(Molière, <i>M. de Pourceaugnac</i>)
June 30, 1792 Inchbald	<i>Young Men and Old Women</i>	(Gresset, <i>Le Méchant</i>)
Aug. 23, 1792	<i>Cross Partners</i>	(Suggested by Destouches)
Dec. 1, 1792 Morton	<i>Columbus</i>	(Marmontel, <i>Les Incas</i>)
Sept. 2, 1795 Hoare	<i>Three and the Deuce</i>	(French motif)
May 2, 1795 Holcroft	<i>Deserted Daughter</i>	(Diderot, <i>Père de Famille</i>)
Feb 9, 1797 Hoare	<i>Friend in Need</i>	(Gluck, <i>Le Comte d'Albert</i>)
Apr. 29, 1797 Hoadley	<i>Tutlers</i>	(Molière, <i>L'École des Femmes</i>)
Oct. 7, 1797 Porter	<i>Chimney Corner</i>	(Probably French)
Feb. 13, 1798 Holcroft	<i>He's Much to Blame</i>	(Ferriol, <i>Campalaisant</i>)
Apr. 24, 1798 Colman ⁵	<i>Blue Devils</i>	(French farce)
Apr. 27, 1798	<i>Matrimony</i>	(French <i>petite pièce</i>)
Nov. 14, 1798 Hoare	<i>Captive of Spilburg</i>	(Genlis, <i>Le Souterrain</i>)

^a Date of production in one of the three London playhouses: Drury Lane, Covent Garden, or Haymarket.

³ Altered from Betterton's play.

⁴ Hints from this play.

⁵ The Younger.

<i>Date</i>	<i>English Play</i>	<i>French Original</i>
Dec. 11, 1798	<i>Albert and Adelaide</i>	(Genlis, <i>Le Souterrain</i>)
July 13, 1799 Heartwell	<i>Castle of Sorrento</i>	(<i>Le Prisonnier</i>)
May 1, 1800 Cobb	<i>Paul and Virginia</i>	(St Pierre, <i>Paul et Virginie</i>)
July 15, 1800 Kemble	<i>Point of Honor</i>	(Mercier, <i>Déserteur</i>)
Feb. 24, 1801 Holcroft	<i>Deaf and Dumb</i>	(Bouilly, <i>L'Abbé de l'Épée</i>)
Oct. 14, 1801 Holcroft	<i>The Escapes</i>	(French setting)
July 31, 1802 Boaden	<i>Voice of Nature</i>	(Caizniz, <i>Jugement de Salomon</i>)
Nov. 13, 1802 Holcroft	<i>Tale of Mystery</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Cœlina</i>)
Nov. 17, 1802 Cobb	<i>House to be Sold</i>	(<i>Maison à Vendre</i>)
July 25, 1803 Colman ^a	<i>Love Laughs at Locksmiths</i>	(Bouilly, <i>Une Folie</i>)
Nov. 1, 1803 Cobb	<i>Wife of Two Husbands</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Femme à Deux Maris</i>)
Nov. 12, 1803	<i>Scapin in Masquerade</i>	(Segur, <i>Crispine Duegne</i>)
Aug. 22, 1804 Colman ^a	<i>Gay Deceivers</i>	(<i>Événements Imprévus</i>)
Nov. 20, 1804 Kenney	<i>Matrimony</i>	(Marsollier, <i>Adophe et Clara</i>)
Apr. 26, 1805 Elliston	<i>Venetian Outlaw</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Trois Visages</i>)
Apr. 28, 1805 Kenle	<i>Personation</i>	(Dieulafoy, <i>Défiance et Malice</i>)
Jan. 28, 1806 Colman	<i>We Fly By Night</i>	(Picaud, <i>Le Conteur</i>)
Apr. 28, 1806 Hook	<i>Invisible Girl</i>	(French <i>petite pièce</i>)
Nov. 24, 1806 Hook	<i>Tekeli</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Tekeli</i>)
July 16, 1807 Hook	<i>Fortress</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Forteresse du Danube</i>)
Dec. 1, 1807 Hewetson	<i>Blind Boy</i>	(<i>L'Illustre Aveugle</i>)
Feb. 25, 1808 Allingham	<i>Who Wins?</i>	(French translation)
Mar. 31, 1808 Dibdin	<i>Bonifacio and Bridgetina</i>	(Martainville, same)
June 1, 1808 Skeffington	<i>Mysterious Bride</i>	(<i>Fausse Épouse</i>)
June 21, 1808 Greffuhle	<i>Portrait of Cervantes</i>	(Dieulafoy, same)
June 21, 1808 Kemble	<i>Plot and Counterplot</i>	(Dieulafoy, <i>Cervantes</i>)
July 29, 1808 Colman	<i>The Africans</i>	(Florian, <i>Les Nouvelles</i>)
Aug. 31, 1808 Pocock	<i>Yes or No?</i>	(Based on French)
Oct. 7, 1808 Dibdin	<i>Forest of Her- manstadt</i>	(Caizniz, same)
Nov. 10, 1808 Hook	<i>Siege of St Quintin</i>	(<i>Les Mines de Pologne</i>) ^a
Nov. 10, 1808 Reynolds	<i>The Evil</i>	(Mme Cotton, <i>Elisabeth</i>)
Dec. 1, 1808 Lewis	<i>Venoni</i>	(Boutet, <i>La Victime Cloîtrée</i>)
Dec. 5, 1808 Tobin	<i>School for Authors</i>	(Marmontel, <i>Le Connoisseur</i>)
Feb. 7, 1809 Greffuhle	<i>Is He a Prince?</i>	(French farce)
May 1, 1809	<i>Temper</i>	(<i>Le Grondeur</i>)
Feb. 16, 1810 Greffuhle	<i>A Budget of Blunders</i>	(Probably French)

^a Written by Pixierécourt or Bouilly.

	<i>Date</i>		<i>English Play</i>	<i>French Original</i>
July 3, 1810	Dimond		<i>Doubtful Son</i>	(Beaumarchais, <i>L'Autre Tartuffe</i>)
July 9, 1810	Bland		<i>Trick upon Travelers</i>	(Scarron, <i>Roman Comique</i>)
May 6, 1812	Arnold		<i>Devil's Bridge</i>	(Probably French)
Feb. 24, 1814	Pocock		<i>Wandering Boys</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Pelerin Blanc</i>)
Sept. 10, 1814			<i>Saracen's Head</i>	(Probably French)
Sept. 30, 1814	Harris		<i>Forest of Bondy</i>	(Pixierécourt, <i>Chien de Montargis</i>)
Nov. 1, 1814	Arnold ⁷		<i>Jean de Paris</i>	(Marsollier, <i>Jean de Paris</i>)
Feb. 1, 1815	Dimond		<i>Brother and Sister</i>	(Patrat, <i>Heureuse Erreur</i>)
Mar. 29, 1815	Arnold		<i>Unknown Guest</i>	(Zoranne et Zulnor)
June 15, 1815	Arnold		<i>Charles the Bold</i>	(Pixierécourt, same)
Aug. 19, 1815	Arnold		<i>King's Proxy</i>	(Probably French)
Aug. 28, 1815	Pocock		<i>Maid and the Magpie</i>	(<i>La Pie Voleuse</i>)

English plays taken from the French during this period were apparently selected by English adapters for one or more of the following reasons: (1) Some of the French comedies showed a strongly defined moral purpose, such as we find in Destouches's "Le Glorieux," adapted into English by Thomas Holcroft as "The School for Arrogance." The moral note was in accord with theatrical taste of the period. (2) Some of the French plays offered to the English adapters: lively farce, produced by tricks, chance-happenings, and intrigue, such as we find in Molière's "M. de Pourceaugnac," altered by Miss Parsons as "Intrigues of a Morning." (3) Other French plays echoed the current Rousseauistic philosophy, such as we find in Mme Genlis's "Zélie," adapted by Mrs. Inchbald as "The Child of Nature." (4) Finally many of the French plays afforded spectacular, melodramatic material, popularized by Pixierécourt.

Despite the fact that the plays taken from the French during these years may not in every case be intrinsically important, they are, nevertheless, interesting historically to the student who may be tracing English dramatic tendencies of the last century.

EDITH WRAY.

Ohio University.

⁷ Dibdin probably helped in writing of play.

DOPPELDRUCKE VON WIELANDS DEUTSCEM
MERKUR

Prolegomena v, No. 195 weist Seuffert darauf hin, dass nach *Ausgew. Briefe* III, 156 eine neue Auflage des 1. Bandes hergestellt worden war. Diesen Neudruck, von dem Bogen K übrigens mit dem Originaldruck identisch ist, besitze ich, dazu einen dritten Druck, von Seuffert als Nachdruck bezeichnet. Von dem 2.-4. Bande liegen mir zwei Drucke vor, von späteren Jahrgängen habe ich keine Doppeldrucke entdeckt. Die ganze Einrichtung der späteren Drucke ist übrigens der der Originaldrucke so tauschend ähnlich, dass nur der Vermerk auf dem Titel: *Frankfurt und Leipzig*, ihre Unechtheit andeuten würde. Dabei ist jedoch zu bemerken, dass z. B. der echte Originaldruck von *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* mit dem Titelblatt *Frankfurt und Leipzig*, 1795, 1796 vorkommt; ähnlich kommt auch der Originaldruck von Schillers *Jungfrau von Orleans* mit dem Titelblatt *Frankfurt und Leipzig*, 1802, vor.

ERSTER BAND. 1773. Titel, Z. 9 Weimar J^{ab} Frankfurt und Leipzig J^c. Rückseite des Titels: Nachricht. Von diesem Journal wird künftig . . . J^{ab}, fehlt J^c (d. h. die Rückseite ist hier leer). S. VI, 22 Vervollkommung J^{ab} Vollkommenheit J^c. VII, 5. 6 interessierte J^{ac} interesierte J^b. VIII, 10 eines jeden J^{ab} eines jedes J^c. IX, 19 zum denken J^{ac} zum Denken J^b. XV, 20 itzt J^{ac} izt J^b. XVIII, 20 feyrlichstem J^a feyerlichstem J^{bc}. 25, 19 Sollt' ich J^{ab} Soll' ich J^c. 27, 2 in einen J^{ac} In einen J^b. 31, 8 Rosseau J^{ab} Rousseau J^c. 33, 34 ver-| nachlässiget J^{ac} vernachlās-| siget J^b. 35, 15; 38, 24 gesezt J^{ac} gesetzt J^b. 40, 4 Wirkung J^{ab} Wirkung J^c. 41, 27 der Alcestis J^{ab} des Alcestes J^c. 45, 29 häßlichen J^{ab} heßlichen J^c. 46, 17 zwoote J^{ab} zwote J^c. 47, 1 unwissend daß J^a unwissend, daß J^{bc}. 55, 3 kann J^{ac} kan J^b. 63, 21 triumphiert J^{ab} triumphiret J^c. 65, 19 Gebrauch J^{ab} Grauch J^c Drf. 67, 8 Nachen J^{ab} Rachen J^c Drf. 68, 12 eydlich J^{ac} eylich J^b Drf. 71, 10 hohlen J^{ac} holen J^b. 72, 1 Klagweiber J^{ab} Klageweiber J^c. 74, 1 Opferschalen J^{ac} Opferschaalen J^b. 224, 2 von jeher J^{ac} von je her J^b. 224, 3 Fuse J^{ac} Fusse J^b. 236, 20 hinnabstürzt J^{ac} hinabstürzt J^b. 237, 1 blösen J^{ac} blossen J^b. 239, 12 interessiren J^a interessiren J^{bc}. 241, 1 gegenüber J^{ac} gegen über J^b. 243, 6

dir Alceste J^{ac} die Alceste J^b *Drf.* 243, 13 Menschheit J^{ac} Menschen J^b. 244, 20 im Olymp J^{ac} in Olymp J^b. 245, 26 Ideent J^a *Drf.* Ideen J^{bc}. Z. 27 nich J^a *Drf.* nicht J^{bc}. 248, 7 oscuro J^a obscuro J^b.

ZWEYTER BAND. 1773. Hier ist neben dem Originaldruck (J^a) nur ein zweiter Druck mit der Angabe *Frankfurt und Leipzig*, vorhanden. In diesem fehlt der in J^a vorhandene Vorbericht, *Der Herausgeber an das Teutsche Publicum* (S. iii-xvi). 169, 19 reizbarers J^a reizbares J^b. 170, 20 grossen J^a großen J^b. 170, 27 eklern J^a ecklern J^b. 176, 7 unter dem J^a unter den J^b. 178, 2 in den J^a in dem J^b. 178, 8 ehmaligen J^a ehemaligen J^b. 182, 19 vor ihn J^a vor ihm J^b. 183, 11. 30 Hermanns J^a Herrmanns J^b. 183, 18 mit dem J^a mit den J^b. 183, 19 manchfaltige J^a mannigfaltige J^b. 184, 11 Werkzeug J^a Werkzeuge J^b. 210, 1 Rosseau J^a Rousseau J^b. 211, 17 kan J^a kann J^b: *auch sonst ofters so*. 212, 14 bestätigt J^a bestatigt J^b. 218, 18 gesetzt J^a gesetzt J^b. 223, 4 stufenweise J^a stufenweise J^b 224, 12 könne J^a können J^b. 224, 13 Manchfaltigkeit J^a Mannichfaltigkeit J^b. 225, 12 balder J^a balder J^b. 232, 21 nur nicht J^a mir nicht J^b. 234, 7 verborgnen J^a verborgen J^b. 306, 23 jedes J^a jeder J^b. 308, 11 Alle Urtheile J^a Aller Urtheile J^b. 308, 20 entschiedenes J^a entscheidendes J^b. 309, 3 Litterar-Geschichte J^a Litteratur-Geschichte J^b. 310, 8 den Felde J^a *Drf.* dem Felde J^b. 310, 18 Ihm J^a ihm J^b. 311, 6 könnten J^a konnten J^b. 311, 9 ubrigends iederzeit J^a übrigens jederzeit J^b. 311, 16 an den J^a an dem J^b. 312, 12 genöthiget J^a genöthigt J^b. 312, 23 wohl ersagter J^a wohlersagter J^b. 316, 10 Neufchadel J^a Neufchatel J^b.

DRITTER BAND. 1773. Auch hier trägt der zweite Druck (J^b) die Ortsangabe *Frankfurt und Leipzig*. Ferner enthält er am Schluss zwei Blätter, die dem Originaldruck J^a fehlen: "An das Publikum. Der Zusammenschreiber, Verfasser und Verleger des deutschen Merkurs, kurz, der Herr HR. Wieland, hat sich die Mühe gegeben, dem Publikum viel Gehäßiges von dem Nachdrucke seines Merkurs zu sagen. Man ist deshalb genöthiget, eben dem Publikum die Ursache dieser Unternehmung anzuzeigen, vielleicht wird dasselbe alsdann mit mehrerer Nachsicht davon urtheilen, und diesen Nachdruck wenigstens nicht ganz für so ungerecht halten, als es ein jeder Nachdruck ist, den ein Buchhändler dem andern zum Schaden veranstaltet . . . Aus diesen Ursachen ist

der Nachdruck des deutschen Merkurs unternommen, wovon man auch die Fortsetzung verspricht, und sollte der Herr Hofrath Wieland auch noch mehr Bogen für einen halben Louisd'or liefern wollen. Das Publikum wird ihn künftig allemal, obgleich acht Tage später, doch aber besser gedruckt und wohlfeiler erhalten, ohne lange vorher darauf subscribiren oder pranumeriren zu dürfen . . ." Hieraus erhellt ziemlich sicher, dass der Druck mit der Ortsangabe *Frankfurt und Leipzig* als Nachdruck anzusehen ist. Ich bemerke noch, dass dieser Druck häufig auf deutschen Bibliotheken anzutreffen ist, die zwei Blätter *An das Publikum* fehlen jedoch fast durchweg. Lesarten: S. 3, 2 Teutsche J^a Deutsche J^b. 100, 24 einzuraumen J^a einzuramen J^b. 105, 18 Göttingl. J^a Gottting. J^b. 106, 30 fodert J^a fordert J^b: vgl. 131, 18; 187, 17. 111, 17 weisen J^a weissen J^b. 112, 21 wißt J^a wißt J^b. 116, 28 alle ehrlichen J^a alle ehrliche J^b. 119, 7. 31 kan J^a kann J^b: *ofters so*. 120, 8 wirklich J^a wirklich J^b. 121, 29 Unglaubigen J^a Unglaubigen J^b. 122, 9 bloße J^a bloß J^b. 124, 5 marmornern J^a marmornen J^b. 126, 13 grundlichern J^a grundlichen J^b. 131, 18 erfordert J^a erfodert J^b. 135, 8 Ahnung J^a Ahndung J^b. 137, 13 ihrem J^a ihren J^b. 157, 19 Kräfte! J^a Kräfte; J^b. 186, 1 Empfindung J^a Empfindungen J^b. 186, 8 zärtlichern J^a zärtlichen J^b. 187, 17 erforderlichen J^a erforderlichen J^b. 187, 24 ausgedruckt J^a ausgedrückt J^b. 190, 25 weitläufig J^a weitläufig J^b. 191, 3 Weitläufigkeit J^a Weitläufigkeit J^b. 298, 22 interessiert J^a interessiret J^b. 299, 3. 9. 32 teutschen J^a deutschen J^b: *ofters so*.

VIERTER BAND. 1773. Auch hier hat der spätere Druck die Angabe: *Frankfurt und Leipzig*. Lesarten: 34, 10 Namens J^a Namens J^b: *ofters so*. 36, 19 selbsteigner J^a selbsteigener J^b. 38, 6 erfoderte J^a erforderte J^b. 38, 19 ungefehr J^a ungefähr J^b. 40, 1 Ihnen J^a ihnen J^b. 40, 10 in Schmerzen J^a im Schmerzen J^b. 41, 8 Sie J^a sie J^b. 46, 17. 18 Hofschranzen J^a Hofschranken J^b. 47, 21 antwortet J^a antwortete J^b. 48, 8 mir meine J^a dir deine J^b. Z. 8^a dir deine J^a mir meine J^b. 49, 21 Entwicklung J^a Entwickelung J^b. 57, 18 Francken J^a Franken J^b. 57, 20 weitläufigen J^a weitläufigen J^b. 58, 15 literariam J^a litterariam J^b. 61, 9 Probe! J^a Probe: J^b. 61, 27 befödert J^a befördert J^b. 64, 1 lezlich J^a letztlich J^b. 65, 2. 3 bedauern J^a bedauern J^b. 65, 8 einer geistlichen Oper J^a eine geistliche Oper J^b. 65, 19 jertz J^a jetzt J^b. 69, 22 Den Pluto selbst zur Wiedergabe zwingen J^a:

der ganze Vers fehlt J^b. 154, 11 auszudrucken J^a auszudrücken J^b. 157, 25 Dienst J^a Dienste J^b. 162, 10 verstorbnen J^a verstorbenen J^b. 162, 30 hatte J^a hätte J^b. 164, 23 nemlichen J^a nämlichen J^b. 165, 13 in zehnten Tage J^a in zehntem Tage J^b. 166, 15 Gold J^a Geld J^b. 168, 10 eines so grossen J^a eines grossen J^b. 170, 13 zu schreiben J^a zu, schreiben J^b. 171, 29 kan J^a kann J^b. 172, 27 Werkes J^a Werks J^b.

W. KURRELMEYER.

FREDEGUNDIS AND AUDOVERA

To the innumerable folk-tales and romances of wronged queens discussed by Dr. Schlauch in her fascinating and scholarly study, Chaucer's *Constance and Accused Queens*,¹ can be added a curious incident introduced by the anonymous author of the *Liber Historiae Francorum* (approx. 727) in his résumé of the first six books of Gregory of Tours.² The unscrupulous Fredegundis, greedy for political power is the villainess. The guileless Audovera, wife (or concubine) of Chilpericus of Merovingian fame, is the wronged queen who is finally forced to take the veil, making way for Fredegundis who becomes the lawful queen of Chilpericus.

After the king has set out with Siegebert to fight the Saxons, a daughter is born to Audovera. The malicious and wily Fredegundis, subtly scheming her mistress' downfall, advises her to have the baby baptized immediately, so as to give the king an agreeable surprise upon his return. Since, however, the woman who was to have been the child's godmother was not at hand, Fredegundis urges the unsuspecting Audovera to hold the baby out to the bishop to be sprinkled, the mother thus becoming the godmother of her own child. Chilpericus, upon his return, is informed by Fredegundis of Audovera's shameful deed and, repudiating the latter as his queen because of her double function in the baptism, he orders her to take the veil, and marries Fredegundis.

To understand the vicious consequences of Audovera's innocent

¹ Margaret Schlauch, *Chaucer's Constance and Accused Queens*, New York City, 1927.

² *Liber Historiae Francorum*, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Script. Rer. Merov.*, II, Hannover, 1888, par. 31, pp. 292-3.

act, a brief explanation of the relationship of the godfather and godmother to the child, to each other, and to the parents is necessary.³ The earliest law (530)⁴ declares the spiritual parenthood of the godparents to the child. A later one (692)⁵ forbids marriage between either one of the godparents and either one of the parents in flesh. The last ruling (721)⁶ forbids the marriage of the godparents to each other in view of the fact that in their quality as spiritual father and mother of the child, they are already considered man and wife, and consequently cannot become so in the flesh. It is with the knowledge of the second ruling, the sin of marriage between the father of the child and its godmother, that Fredegundis caused the queen to be repudiated and herself elevated to queenly rank.

This incident, found neither in Gregory of Tours' *Historia* nor in that of Fredegarius, contains, in spite of its great dramatic appeal, no historical basis, and has therefore to be relegated to the realms of folk lore. Godefroid Kurth⁷ proves, first: that since the ruling against such a marriage was promulgated in 692, and the incident in question occurred in the middle of the sixth century, the ruling could obviously not have been known to Fredegundis. Secondly: Auovera, whether she was the legal wife or only the concubine (Chilperic had so many *compagnes* that Auovera's position is not clear), her act in either case would not have had serious consequences. As a legal wife, her union with Chilperic would have been indissoluble since her error was committed in ignorance. As a concubine there would have been no legal union. Moreover it is inconceivable that the lewd Merovingian Chilperic, accustomed to violate all the canons of the church, would have given up his lady-love for theological reasons. Finally Chilperic did not make an expedition with Siegebert against the Saxons.

*New York University,
Washington Square College.*

PAULINE TAYLOR.

³ Godefroid Kurth, *Histoire Poétique des Mérovingiens*, Paris, 1893, pp. 389-91.

⁴ *Cod. Justin.* V, iv, 26.

⁵ Hefelé, *Conciliengeschichte* III, p. 387.

⁶ Hefelé, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 362, 516; *Leg. Liutprand*, c. 34 (Pertz, *Legg.* IV, p. 124); *Codex Carolinus*, ep. 3, Jaffé, *Bibl. Rer. German.* IV.

⁷ Godefroid Kurth, *op. cit.*, pp. 391-2.

A NOTE ON THE CYRANO-SWIFT CRITICISM

The indebtedness of *Gulliver's Travels* to Cyrano de Bergerac's *Les Etats et Empires de la Lune et du Soleil* (1657 and 1662) has been treated and established by E. Honncher, Tho. Borkowsky, Paul Thierkopf, Max Poll and others¹; and Mr. W. A. Eddy has recently gathered the results together for his "*Gulliver's Travels*," *A Critical Study*.² Mr. Eddy has not noted, however, the apparent uncertainty cast upon the entire subject by Mr. Robert Stanley Forsythe's suggestion that there may be some connection between *Gulliver's Travels* and Tom D'Urfey's *Wonders in the Sun, or The Kingdom of the Birds* (1706).³ Mr. Allardyce Nicol, ignoring the work of Mr. Eddy, makes a similar suggestion in *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (1925).

The possibility of a connection between *Wonders in the Sun* and *Gulliver's Travels* is disturbing to the Swift-Cyrano criticism because of a fact that has escaped the notice of both specialists in the drama, namely, that D'Urfey's *Wonders in the Sun* is copied in great part from those same fantastic voyages by Bergerac, already claimed as a source for *Gulliver*.⁴ It appears possible, then, that *Wonders in the Sun* may have been the direct source for those elements of *Gulliver* which have been shown to be significantly similar to *Les Etats et Empires de la Lune et du Soleil*. To add probability to this conjecture Swift knew of D'Urfey,⁵ and must have known about *Wonders in the*

¹ Honncher, E., "Quellen zu Dean Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*," *Anglia*, x, 1888, pp. 397-427; Borkowsky, Tho., "Quellen zu Swift's *Gulliver*," *Anglia*, xv, 1893, pp. 345-389. (Reprinted as a monograph, Halle, 1893.); Thierkopf, Paul, "Swift's *Gulliver* und seine französischen Vorgänger," *Dreissigster Jahresbericht über die Guericke-Schule in Magdeburg*, Magdeburg, Baensch, 1899; Poll, Max, "The Sources of *Gulliver's Travels*," *Bulletin of the University of Cincinnati*, no. 24, 1903(?).

² Princeton, 1923. Cf. same author's "Cyrano de Bergerac and *Gulliver's Travels*," *MLN*, xxxviii, 344-345.

³ "A Study of the Plays of Thomas D'Urfey," *Western Reserve University Bulletins*, new series, vol. xix, no. 5; *Literary Section Supplement*, Cleveland, Ohio, May, 1916, p. 152.

⁴ Cf. Aldington, Richard, *Cyrano de Bergerac, Voyages to the Moon and Sun*, London, 1923. Appendix I.

⁵ Cf. *Tale of a Tub* (Temple Scott ed.), pp. 4, 37, 142. Cf. Gückel, W. und Günther, E., *D. Defoes und J. Swifts Belesenheit und literarische Kritik*, *Palaestra* 149, Leipzig, 1925.

Sun (although he was in Ireland at its production in 1706), while there is no direct mention of Bergerac in any of Swift's preserved writing.

I have, therefore, carefully investigated *Wonders in the Sun* to determine if it is the direct source for any part of *Gulliver*, and my conclusion is that it is not. In the first place Mr. Forsythe's statement, concerning a passage in *Wonders in the Sun*, that "the dialogue between Gonzales and Bellygorge on 'affairs subsolar' in which the former discloses the pettinesses and rascalities of terrestrial life is a foreshadowing of certain passages in *Gulliver's Travels* (As in *Part II, A Voyage to Brobdingnag*, chap. 6)" has no weight. To use extra terrestrial machinery to "disclose the pettinesses and rascalities of terrestrial life" is a major purpose in *Les Etats et Empires . . .*, and the device is also found in Evariste Gherardi's *L'Empereur dans la Lune*, from which it was copied into Mrs. Behn's *The Emperor of the Moon* (1687); and I find either of these as likely a source for the similar elements in *Brobdingnag* as D'Urfey's dialogue. Mr. Nicoll specifies only one thing in *Wonders of the Sun* as suggestive of *Gulliver*. It is D'Urfey's division of the birds into High Flyers and Low Flyers. But these terms were commonplaces of the period, and form the basis for Defoe's allegory, *The Consolidator* (1705), a far more probable source for Swift.

Numerous other parallels between *Wonders in the Sun* and *Gulliver*, which I have discovered, fail equally to establish anything, most of them being common also to *Les Etats et Empires de la Lune et du Soleil*. I have further reviewed the *Gulliver* source studies, and have found that a considerable number of the striking parallels between *Les Etats et Empires de la Lune et du Soleil* and *Gulliver's Travels* cannot be accounted for by the hypothesis that Swift only knew *Cyrano* through D'Urfey. Nor have I been able to account for them by considering the other English imitations of and borrowings from *Cyrano* to which I have access. My conclusion is that no influence of *Wonders in the Sun* upon *Gulliver's Travels* can be established according to the suggestions made by Forsythe and Nicoll, and that those suggestions do not invalidate the source studies of *Gulliver* made by Mr. Eddy and his predecessors.

A OR AN?

In the *Grub-street Journal* for January 24, 1733-4, appeared a philological letter cast in the humorous form of a "Humble Petition of the Letter H." The petitioner complains that "he" has no recognized status as a letter in the English alphabet, and then, having justified his existence on the ground of ancient and honorable service in the older Greek as a letter corresponding to the Hebrew Heth, goes on to the details of his ill-usage in English.

"Your petitioner therefore cannot but humbly protest against the ill usage he has met with in these later ages. And he begs leave to remonstrate against the prevailing custom of authors or printers, or both, who always set the particle *An* before a word that begins with H: by which method they injuriously deny that he is any letter at all, since, to be sure, they will not call him a *vowel*.—And your petitioner humbly proposes, that the same rule in this case may be made for writing, as is by a good custom settled for speaking: that is to say, that *An* should be used before a word that begins with H, provided the H be not sounded in reading, as for instance, *An honest man*; but that A should be used, when the H in the beginning of the next word is sounded in reading, as a consonant, as *A house, a horse, a high-lander*, etc. If men will write *An house, an horse, an high-lander*, they ought to read so too. But if it be ridiculous to read so, it must be as ridiculous to write in this manner. The thing would appear ridiculous to any man, if he should thus write and pronounce the following story.

"*An Highlander upon an horse, came to an house, standing in an highway, near an habitation of an honourable gentleman of Aberdeen, and with an humble voice, and an heavy sigh, and an hideous groan, complained of an horrible abuse, put upon him by an household-servant of the said gentleman. An humanity uncommon possessed an heart in that house, from whence proceeded an hatred of the injustice, and an hearty concern for the person injured in such an high degree, and such an heinous manner, and an help sufficient, etc.*

"If authors will not speak in this manner, they should not write thus neither. And when an author carefully avoids this ridiculous custom, the printer deserves severe censure for altering the spelling of the manuscript; which yet I know some printers, in this

instance, have injuriously ventured to do. Let the writing and printing be conformed to the established custom of reading and speaking; let *an* never appear before an H in print, but where it is the custom to set it in pronunciation, and then some reparation will be made to the abused character of,

“honoured Sir,

“your humble petitioner,

“The Letter H.

“P. S.—Is it not evidently fit, that the same rule should take place in determining when to set *A*, and when *An*, before *U*. If this letter be pronounced as a mere vowel, as in *unhappy*, *unfortunate*, etc., it is proper to write, as we speak, *An unhappy*, *an unfortunate* creature. But when the letter *U* is sounded like the word *You*, as in *universe*, *unity*, *union*, etc., it is ridiculous to say, and therefore ridiculous to write, *an unity*, *an union*, etc. All the world says, and therefore should write *a union*, *a unity*, etc.”

This incisive petition is somewhat surprising for its independence and its defiance of tradition in the “classical” period of the early eighteenth century. It is also interesting as an illustration of the force with which conservatism and the weight of inertia oppose the modifying influences of colloquial use.

It will be noticed that the author of the petition designates two classes of words which he says are always preceded in speech by *a*, but in literary usage by *an*: words with an initial aspirated *h*, and words like *unit* or *euphony*. The origin of such usage was, of course, logical enough. It lay, in the first instance, in the lack of standing of *h* as a regular consonant—a position doubtless affected also by the influence of Old French with its mute *h*. In the second case, that of *unit*, *euphony*, etc., the natural origin of the usage is to be seen in the pronunciation of the Middle English *u* from French and Latin *u*, as (iʏ), which would logically be preceded by *an*.

In time, however, the *h* got back into good standing and the (iʏ) became (iʊ), and colloquial speech, taking cognizance of the fact, replaced *an* with *a*. To the eighteenth century petitioner the reading of “an house” or “an union” was ridiculous—“all the world,” he declares, “says *a union*,” and one may guess from his instances that it also said *a house*. Moreover, one may infer from his emphasis on the uniformity of the colloquial usage that it must

have been established for a considerable time. In a rather colloquial source a century older is to be noted "A ubiquitarie." This seems to be the only instance furnished by the *New English Dictionary* of a reflection in writing of the colloquial usage of *a* in this position. As a matter of fact, *an* persisted before (*in*) until well along into the nineteenth century. A musician (Mason) could write "a eucharistical" in 1795, and early nineteenth century scientists wrote "a eudiometer," but more literary authors, Tennyson (1847), Mrs. Gaskell (1865), and Lecky (1869) still clung to *an university*, *an euphuism*, *an euthanasia*. An illuminating instance of the force of attraction in such a tradition is Dr. Johnson's phrase *an yearly payment* (*Life of Ascham*, 1763), which cannot make even a historical claim to recognition, but merely illustrates a strongly conservative mental attitude. That is, in such a point Johnson's tendency was not merely to conserve the literary tradition, but to increase its force.

On the other hand, the use of *an* before *h* seems to have yielded much more readily to colloquial influence. It is easy enough to find such instances as *a heape*, *a hand*, in late sixteenth and seventeenth century citations. Nevertheless the old style did not yield entirely. Under *heap* in the *New English Dictionary*, for instance, one finds *a heape* from Shakespeare and Fuller, but *an heape* from Spenser, the Bible (1611) and even from Goldsmith (1774). Yet on the whole the literary usage of *a* before *h* was so frequent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that, after all, the petitioner could not have meant to attack all those who committed themselves to writing, but only the more conservative. And it may be said, of course, that some of his instances—as *an honourable*—are quite beside the point.

In present usage, according to the *New English Dictionary* (A adj.²), 1888, *an* has yielded to *a* except before unaccented syllables, as *an historian*, *an euphonic*, *an united*, "though this is all but obsolete in speech, and in writing *a* becomes increasingly common in this position." During the forty years since this statement was made, usage has become still more liberal. H. W. Fowler in his *Dictionary of English Usage* (1926) declares, ". . . *an* was formerly used before an unaccented syllable beginning with *h*, but now that the *h* in such words is pronounced the distinction has become pedantic, and *a historical* should be said and written; simi-

larly *an humble* is now meaningless and undesirable. *A* is now usual also before vowels preceded in fact though not in appearance by the sound of *y* or *w* (a unit, a eulogy, a one)." Apparently if the humble petitioner of 1734 could have waited for two centuries, he would have found very little opposition to his requests.

J. T. HILLHOUSE.

University of Minnesota.

MUSAEUS IN ENGLISH VERSE

A note of mine in *MLN*. (April, 1927) discussed the influence of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* upon early mythological poems. A brief bibliography of English versions of Musaeus may be of some small interest on its own account and add something, at least in a negative way, to the history of Marlowe's reputation.¹

(1) "The historie of Leander and Hero, written by Musaeus, and Englished by me a dozen yeares ago, and in print." So mentioned by Abraham Fleming in his *Virgil's Georgics*, 1589. Not otherwise known. (H. R. Palmer, *List of Editions and Translations*, etc., p. 74.)

(2) Marlowe's fragment.

(3) Chapman's continuation of Marlowe, 1598.

(4) Chapman's translation of Musaeus, 1616.

(5) Sir Robert Stapylton, *Musaeus, on The Loves of Hero and Leander*, 1647. Marlowe and Chapman had no doubts about the antiquity of Musaeus; Stapylton, citing Casaubon and J. C. Scaliger, offers the first of many discussions. The translation shows no influence of Marlowe, but frequently echoes Chapman's version of 1616. The volume contains translations of the Ovidian Epistles on Hero and Leander.

(6) *The Loves of Hero and Leander*, 1651. The passages from Marlowe burlesqued in this piece were noted in the former article. The metamorphosis of the lovers into a crab and a flounder may have been suggested by the metamorphosis in Chapman's continuation, and the story of Cophetua by Chapman's Tale of Teras.

(7) Wycherley's travesty, 1669. The former article mentioned the portions of Marlowe burlesqued.

¹ L. Chabaliar, *Héro et Léandre* (Paris, 1911), p. 135, gives an incomplete list of versions of Musaeus—and I may have missed some. My list includes only pieces which have some relation to Musaeus or Marlowe (with a few possible exceptions), and does not take account of many short poems, or of ballads or chapbooks.

(8) *Two Essays. The former Ovid. De Arte Amandi, or, The Art of Love. The First Book. The later Hero and Leander of Musaeus. From the Greek. By a Well-wisher to the Mathematics.* . . London, 1682.

The preface disclaims any ability to live up to Dryden's standards of translation, and contrasts "the Old Phlegmatick, Whining, Sighing, Natural State of Love" with "our Modish, Airy, Rallying, Bartering, Improved Way." After that one knows what to expect; Hero is one of "the killing Species." Chapman's continuation and Stapylton contribute a phrase each, and there are one or two possible though not probable echoes of Marlowe.

(9) L. Eusden, *Hero and Leander*, in Dryden's *Miscellany*, Part Six, 1709, pp. 594 ff. About 450 lines of glossy poetic diction, "the angry Fair" and so forth. A few phrases are borrowed from the version of 1682 and from Stapylton; the spirit and language of Marlowe are far to seek.

(10) A. S. Catcott, *The Poem of Musaeus, on the Loves of Hero and Leander*, 1715. About 650 lines. Lovers should not "heedless gaze on the too killing Fair." About fifteen lines or phrases come from Eusden.

(11) L. Theobald, *Hero and Leander*, in *The Grove*, 1721. The translation, though frigid as usual, is closer to Musaeus than any since Stapylton's. There is no hint of Marlowe. Theobald borrows half a dozen times from Eusden and Catcott, and a few phrases from Stapylton and the version of 1682.

(12) James Sterling, *Hero and Leander*, 1728. The translator finds in this "Notable Amour" "as much of the True Belle Esprit, as any of their [French] Writers of Gallantry" can show. About 800 diffuse lines, to which the inevitable Eusden contributes a few ideas and phrases.

(13) R. Luck, in *A Miscellany of New Poems*, 1736. The author, who writes to relieve gout, addresses himself, like a number of the other translators, "To the Ladies." He has seen no translation before his own, and originality is proved by such expressions as "to frisk a Jig."

(14) G. Bally, *Hero and Leander*, 1747. Musaeus doubtless sang to please "a sparkling Toast," and so does Bally, hoping to soothe "a Belle of Taste" and "charm a Prude." He borrows from Eusden, Catcott, and Theobald.

(15) Chaballier records a version by Slade, 1753, which I have not seen.

(16) Francis Fawkes, in *Works of Anacreon*, 1760. The preface quotes the line "Which old Musaeus so divinely sung," which comes from Waller's poem, "Of the Danger His Majesty (being Prince) Escaped in the Road at St. Andere." Fawkes says the first English translation was by Stapylton! His own piece echoes preceding versions, drawing about thirty times on the choice diction of Eusden.

(17) E. B. Greene, *Hero and Leander*, 1773. The preface quotes Waller's line, probably from Fawkes, whose translation is Greene's chief prop. Since Greene is full of gems like "the tear Neptunian" one is not surprised to learn that Homer has much "false wit."

(18) "Hero's Complaint to Leander," in J. Nichols's *Select Collection of Poems*, 1780, I, 176-9. Most of the piece seems to be condensed from Ovid's Epistle of Hero, but for the end Musaeus is used.

(19) E. Taylor, *Werter to Charlotte & Hero and Leander*, 1783-84. This has a little less poetic diction than its predecessors.

(20) G. Bedford, *Hero and Leander*, 1797. This version has similar negative and comparative merits. Marlowe is as far away as ever.

(21) C. A. Elton, *Specimens of the Classic Poets*, 1814, III, 329 ff. The preface names as former translators "Marloe, Stappylton, Eusden, Fawkes." There is no trace of Marlowe.

(22) Leigh Hunt, *Hero and Leander*, 1819. An original poem, though parts of Musaeus are used. Marlowe's influence is not evident unless it contributed in a general way to Hunt's freshness of feeling and expression.

(23) Chaballier names a version by Adam, 1822, which I have not seen.

(24) Thomas Hood, *Hero and Leander*, 1827. An original poem of about 800 lines. There seems to be no definite influence of Marlowe, though there are conceits somewhat in his manner.

(25) Tennyson, "Hero to Leander," in *Poems Chiefly Lyrical*, 1830. A brief and empty piece, with no verbal echoes of Marlowe, unless the word "turret" suggests him.

(26) E. Arnold, *Hero and Leander*, 1873. What one would expect from the author of *The Light of Asia*. No trace of Marlowe.

(27) Sir Theodore Martin, a version of Schiller's poem, 1889.

(28) John Drinkwater, *The Death of Leander*, 1906. A piece of thin romanticism, attempting to philosophize the theme; not a version of Musaeus.

(29) E. E. Sikes, *Hero and Leander*, 1920. Of course an accurate and scholarly translation.

(30) Brookes More, *Hero and Leander* (Cornhill Pub. Co., Boston, 1926). An original poem, with a good deal of romantic verbiage.

This list of versions, mostly barren—except as one engendered another—makes it painfully clear that Marlowe's poem dropped out of sight in the 18th century, at any rate out of sight of the versifiers who might have been expected to know it—though even such a sympathetic Elizabethan scholar as Warton missed its beauty. In that century the chief single influence was the ineffable Eusden. The venerable method of parallel-hunting cannot of course measure Marlowe's influence on the better poets of the 19th century, whether they treated his particular theme or not. These versions of Musaeus, bad as most of them are, reflect no less clearly than Homeric translations the progress of poesy from the ornate. "conceited" sensuousness of Marlowe through coarse and cynical burlesque to eighteenth-century pieces in the taste of "the Town,"

and, in the last century, original variations on the subject with warmer feeling and conventional romantic style.²

DOUGLAS BUSH.

University of Minnesota.

CHAUCER AND WORDSWORTH

Wordsworth's sonnet "Edward VI" (*Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, Part II, no. xxxi) begins with a rather puzzling reference to Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale*:

"Sweet is the holiness of Youth"—so felt
Time-honored Chaucer speaking through that Lay
By which the Prioress beguiled the way
And many a Pilgrim's rugged heart did melt.

The reader fails to recollect the quoted phrase in Chaucer's tale; moreover, it does not sound particularly like Chaucer. One may ask oneself, besides, is it not as characteristic of Wordsworth himself as any six words could possibly be?

The explanation is rather amusing. In Wordsworth's uninspired modernization of the *Prioress's Tale* that so curiously succeeds in emptying that truly "matchless tale" of most of its charm, he proceeded upon the theory of making as few changes as possible. "No further deviation from the original has been made than was

² I might add a list of versions of Ovid's two Epistles: G. Turberville, *Heroides*, 1567; W. Saltonstall, *Heroides*, 1626; J. Sherburne, *Heroides*, 1639; R. Stapylton, 1647 (see above, no. 5); *Ovidius Exulans*, 1673 (burlesque; the preface mentions Scarron, who had published a burlesque of Hero and Leander, 1656, and whose travesties had such a vogue in England); *Wits Paraphras'd*, by "M. T.," 1680 (the Bodleian Catalogue says M. T. is Matthew Stevenson; a travesty); *Ovid's Epistles*, translated by several hands, 1680 (the two Epistles by Tate); Alexander Radcliffe, *Ovid Travestie*, 1681; C. Hopkins, *History of Love*, 1695 (the part about Hero and Leander, pp. 433 ff. in the edition of 1709, is based on Ovid); Epistles, in English prose, with the Latin, by N. Bailey, 2nd ed., 1753, St. Barrett, *Ovid's Epistles*, 1759; W. W. Fitzthomas, *Ten Epistles of Ovid*, 1807 (the Hero-Leander Epistles "by a different hand"); Emma Garland, *Ovid's Epistles*, 1842; J. Jump, 1857; J. F. Byrne, 1858; G. Showerman (Loeb Series), 1914.

necessary for the fluent reading and instant understanding of the Author," he explains in the prefatory remarks. In general he has been successful, so far as success is possible in such an undertaking: with one exception, he translates Chaucer's thirty-four stanzas of rime royal into a corresponding number of parallel stanzas. The one exception is what concerns us.

When Wordsworth came to the stanza

Thus hath this widwe hir litel sone y-taught
Our blisful lady, Cristes moder dere,
To worshiþe ay, and he forgat it naught,
For sely child wol alday sone lere;
But ay, whan I remembre on this matere,
Seint Nicholas stant ever in my presence,
For he so yong to Crist did reverence. (ll. 57-63).

he felt, for once, the imperative necessity of expansion, and accordingly changed the seven-line stanza to an eight-line one. The new stanza is this:

This Widow thus her little Son hath taught
Our blissful Lady, Jesu's Mother dear,
To worship aye, and he forgat it not;
For simple infant hath a ready ear.
Sweet is the holiness of youth: and hence
Calling to mind this matter when I may,
Saint Nicholas in my presence standeth aye,
For he so young to Christ did reverence. (ll. 57-64).

It will be seen that the first four lines and the last three are close paraphrases of Chaucer's lines. The fifth line, however, which breaks down the rhyme-scheme of the Chaucerian stanza,

Sweet is the holiness of youth: and hence

is a pure interpolation, and it is the only one in all the thirty-four stanzas.

And this, his sole original contribution, is the line that Wordsworth, in "Edward VI," attributes to "time-honored Chaucer," and holds up to special admiration!

STUART ROBERTSON.

Temple University.

WHO WROTE SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS?

Not long ago I asked Professor Thorleif Larsen whether he would be interested in proving that Shakespeare wrote Shakespeare's plays, particularly if it could be done on the same evidence that has been used to prove the authorship of Bacon. Without giving him much opportunity to remonstrate, I laid before him the Latin sentence *Hi ludi tuiti sibi Fr. Bacono nati*, evolved by Dr. Isaac Hull and published in the *Conservator*, 1897,¹ as a rearrangement of the letters found in that monstrous word *honorificabilitudinitatibus* which appears in *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act V, Scene i. After being shown a few additional lines that I had on a sheet of scratch paper, he suggested (perhaps not as seriously as I thought) that the matter might be embodied in a note for your journal.

So, in an idle hour, I buckled on a suit of Don Quixote's armor and in my private tilt-yard broke a lance on this Latin sentence. *Ludi* got only a slight poke, for if *ludi* = *fabulae* ("plays") be not good classical Latin,² it is authenticated for mediæval times. So *Fr. Bacono nati*, "born of Franciscus Baconus," barely endurable as a poetic figure, got off almost unscathed. But that third weird windmill arm, *tuiti sibi*, which has the merit of being composed of Latin words without the saving grace of meaning anything in its context, I felt at the end I had left completely demolished. *Tuiti sibi*, indeed! "Having preserved [something unmentioned] for themselves!" or, stretching a point (for *tueor*, strictly and regularly a deponent, was used, rarely, as a passive), "having been preserved for themselves." When one looks at these phrases, both appeal to him as the flowers that bloom in the spring appealed to wretched Coco.

After enjoying this exercise and putting up my horse and armor, I found (again through the courtesy of Mr. Haweis) that this windmill had been replaced by a more imposing structure. Sir Edwin

¹ My first acquaintance with this incomprehensible sentence is due to Mr. Lionel Haweis of our library staff; and I find corroboration in G. G. Greenwood, *Is There a Shakespeare Problem?* (1916), p. xiii, but have not been able to get my hands on the *Conservator* itself.

² In passing, one might point out that *ludi* cited for this meaning by Lewis and Short from Suet. *Caes.* 10 (and they might have added a similar passage from Cic. *de Off.*, II, 55) does not mean *dramas* but *games* (at which dramas may well have been presented).

Durning-Lawrence, in *Bacon Is Shake-Speare* (as it is spelled on the title page, or *Shakespeare*, as it appears in the text), ch. x, pp. 84 ff., had worked out from this same Latin word a somewhat better proof sentence, which he describes and defends as a dactylic hexameter: *Hi ludi F. Baconis nati tuiti orbi*,³ "these 'plays,' F. Bacon's offspring, preserved for the world." Aside from the third declension name *Baco*, which Mr. Greenwood l. c. certifies as non-Baconian, the mediæval *ludi* (for *fabulae*), the highly metaphorical *nati*, the rare passive *tuiti*, the atrocious rhythm of the "hexameter," such as Macaulay's schoolboy would surely never have been allowed to perpetrate⁴—faults, however, which might be condoned in one working under the grave restrictions supposed—it seemed to me that the method proved considerably too much.⁵ Taking a little time, therefore, that might have been given to worthier ends, I found several other possible arrangements of the letters in *honorificabilitudinitatibus* "proving" this, that, and the other, of which I subjoin three.

(a) *Huic libro in dant finis. A' titubo'* "They are putting ends [I regret that the plural is inevitable] to this book. Ha! I stagger!" [From the shock?] This sentence, which (*pace Baconicorum omnium dixerim*) is quite superior in Latinity to Dr. Platt's version, and the peer of the "hexameter," proves that a censorship was established in 1597 or 1598 (or was it 1591 or 1594?), and that the board of censors was seriously hampering the author, if not checking his output entirely.

(b) *Hi sunt Iacobi fili; tu ibid. R. nota* "These [*libri*, presumably, or, shall we say, *ludi*?] belong to James's son; you just observe the *R* [abbrev. for *Rex*?] there." Here is cogent argument for royal authorship. But who is meant? Could it have been one of the natural sons of James V of Scotland (who died in 1542)? Is it not more likely to have been the literary James VI, covering his authorship here as elsewhere, and even claiming the plays for his first-born son, Henry (born in 1594)? (James was publishing *The True Law of Free Monarchies* anonymously in 1598.) A most interesting literary conundrum.

³ The third word (or rather letter) being pronounced as *fa* or *effé*.

⁴ To say nothing of the odd reference to "these plays" as early as 1598.

⁵ As Sir Edwin (l. c., p. 99) would seem to have suspected.

(c) *Hastilia vibro; fini ibunt docti*. This demonstrates that the play is Shakespeare's. Perhaps, after the example of Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, it would be in place to annotate and justify this sentence for such as do not see its import immediately.

Hastile, a well-established word, rather a favorite with good Latin poets, for "javelin" and the like.

Uibro (usually spelled nowadays *vibro*), an unimpeachable word used in both prose and poetry for "brandish."

Fini, a dative of end of motion, well known to all sub-freshmen as of frequent occurrence among Latin poets of the best circles, and surely pardonable here, in view of the literature under discussion. The meaning is obvious or can be made so: "to the end," or as we might say, the "bottom" of the matter.

Ibunt and *docti* need no defense. And if we might take the liberty of a trifling hiatus before a strong pause, something which *could* be paralleled (as any schoolboy knows) from the great Vergil himself, we could arrange the above as at least the last five feet of a pretty respectable "hexameter": *Fini ibunt docti: hastilia vibro*.

Perhaps you can imagine with what gusto, being an amateur so far as the Baconian controversy goes, and treading in the place proverbially denied to the angels, I proceeded to translate: "I SHAKE SPEARES; scholars will get to the root of the matter!"

There you have it, capped by a pun in Shakespeare's own manner!

O. J. TODD.

University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C.

A RE-ARRANGEMENT OF *CHRIST AND SATAN*

The Old English poem of *Christ and Satan*, when read as it appears in MS Junius XI in the Bodleian Library, is obviously unsatisfactory in structure. The pronounced breaks in the sense which occur at the beginnings of lines 366 and 665 have led to the prevalent practice of regarding the poem as composed of three divisions, commonly designated by the sub-titles "The Complaints of the Fallen Angels" (ll. 1-365), "The Harrowing of Hell" (ll. 366-664), and "The Temptation" (ll. 665-713). If we are to accept the conclusion indicated by much of the evidence which

Mr. M. D. Clubb has summarized in his recent edition of the work,¹ that *Christ and Satan* is one poem and not three, not only these breaks but also the anomalous placing of Christ's temptation after His resurrection must be accounted for. This Mr. Clubb attempts to do by a hypothesis which assumes the unknown author of the poem to have been so carried away by his inspiration that he disregarded chronology and logical structure.²

Is it necessary to convict the poet of such a lapse? I suggest that the confusion of his work may be due to a simple disarrangement in the course of its scribal transmission. For if, instead of "The Harrowing of Hell," the 67 lines of "The Temptation" be read immediately following line 365, that is, if parts II and III be transposed, not only does the chief anachronism disappear, but the poem assumes a not illogical form, and the transitions are made relatively smooth. The poem then opens with the Creation and closes with Doomsday. The fall of Satan is first described, and the remorseful outcries of himself and his followers are given at length. The first section concludes:

"There is joy for each one who purposes to obey the Savior, and well is it for him who may accomplish that." (ll. 363-365)

In the MS arrangement there now comes a sharp break in the sense:

"That angel-kind before mentioned was called Lucifer, "Light-bearer," in days of old in God's kingdom. Then he instituted strife in glory, so that he wished to possess proud estate." (ll. 366-370)

But if the sections are transposed as I suggest, no such jolt is felt. Instead, a reference to Christ corresponds neatly to that which closes the first section:

"That is the Lord who suffered death for us, the Prince of Angels. Also He, the Lord of Mankind, fasted forty days in the abundance of His mercy." (ll. 665-668)

The temptation is then described, and the section closes with Satan again in hell:

¹ *Christ and Satan* (Yale Studies in English, LXX), New Haven, 1925, pp. xlii-liv.

² *Ibid.*, pp. liv-lvi.

"The false wight, the horrible one, gazed with his eyes about that loathsome cavern, until with terror of torment the host of devils then rose up, the wretched spirits began to complain with words in their tortures, and to say, 'Lo, be thou now thus in evil; thou didst not before desire the good!'" (ll. 727-733)

In the arrangement which I propose these lines are followed by the opening of the "Harrowing" section, (ll. 366-370, quoted above) which continues the subject of Satan. Accounts of the Harrowing, Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost then follow in due order, and at the end come a description of the Last Judgment and an exhortation well fitting the close of an extended religious poem. It causes the poem, moreover, to end on the same note with which it began, that of praise to God as the Lord of Creation:

"Lo, let us in this world resolve that we obey the Savior, that we be mindful of the joy of the spirit through God's gift, how there on high the blessed sons of the Savior themselves dwell in glory. . . . There is a mighty majesty, song before the throne. The King Himself is Lord of All in the Eternal Creation." (ll. 644-648; 662-664)

Is it not possible that in some archetype of the Junius MS the lines now designated as "The Temptation" (ll. 665-end) became displaced from their original position in the poem, perhaps through the loosening of a single leaf, with the result that they appear in the extant copy not in their proper place, but added at the end by way of remedy? That would at least explain why the simple transposition of the second and third sections which I have suggested eliminates both the chief chronological absurdity and the rough transitions which now constitute the principal obstacles to the acceptance of *Christ and Satan* as a unified production.

RICHARD L. GREENE.

Princeton University.

A RODERICK RANDOM PLAY, 1748

Interesting evidence of the immediate popular success of *Roderick Random* has recently been acquired by the Yale Library: "The Northern Heroes; or The *Bloody Contest*, between Charles the *Twelfth*, King of *Sweden*, and Peter the *Great*, Czar of *Muscovy* . . . With a Comic Interlude, call'd The Volunteers; or, the Adventures of *Roderick Random* And his Friend *Strap* . . . As it is now acting . . . at the Great Booth, in *George Yard*, in *West-Smithfield*. London . . . MDCCXLVIII."¹ After an extended prefatory Argument there follow separate lists of the "Persons in the Tragedy" and "Persons in the Comedy," with the names of the actors. The tragedy unhappily lacks the spirit to be even amusing. The comedy, though of crude stuff shamelessly lugged in, is more effective. This portion is announced in the Argument as "*a Sequel to the Life of Roderick Random, and his friend Strap, whose Wives he supposes to prove bad Women, which occasions their going a-volunteering.*" A highly popular camp-follower is one Sutler's widow, to whose favor and fortune Roderick thinks it temporarily worth while to aspire. He suggests to the lady that she dispose of two of her chief suitors in this way (p. 12): "Tell *Garbage* you'll not marry him, unless he reduces himself to the Size of *Slim*; nor *Slim*, till he eats himself up to the Bulk of *Garbage*; and recommend me and *Strap* as proper Persons to instruct 'em." The instruction scenes which follow provide raw meat, and a-plenty, for the holiday crowds at Bartholomew Fair.

A few trifling additional facts are available about the play. Under a condensed title of curious orthography, it was included as the forty-sixth entry in a list of "Plays wrote by anonymous authors in the 17th [sic] century" appended to William Chetwood's *British Theatre* (1750). The fourth edition of Cibber's *Apology* purported to be freshened by a like list, which is, however, simply lifted from Chetwood—including, of course, this entry. In 1764 appeared *The Companion to the Play-House, or An Historical Account of all the Dramatic Writers (and their Works) that have appeared in Great Britain and Ireland*. . . . In the alphabetical

¹ In my *Study in Smollett* I called attention to this title in briefer form, and suggested that the play might be the (unknown) comedy which Walpole said Smollett wrote at Lyttelton's suggestion. The play itself, however, disproves the conjecture conclusively.

list of vol. I is found: "Charles XII K. of Sweden, or, the Adventures of Roderic Random and his Man Strap, 8°, 1748—This Play is a Kind of Tragi-Comedy, was never performed, and seems to have been written as a Ridicule of the ingenious Author of Roderic Random." The dramatic lexicographer had evidently never seen the work himself, for the wording of the title he adopts and the mis-spelling of "Roderic" follow Chetwood exactly, and all the additional information and conjecture offered is untrue. Instead of being in ridicule of Smollett's novel, the piece is a bare-faced attempt to trade upon its popularity; while the designation of the well-known Great Booth in George Yard on the title page, and the complete cast of characters following, would seem to suggest its performance. Henry Morley, in his *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair* (p. 430), is able to give us even the price of the seats, with other interesting minutiae: boxes, 2 s. 6 d.; pit, 1 s. 6 d.; first gallery, 1 s.; upper gallery, 6 d. "New dresses" were promised. Performances were to start at twelve noon—and must have run "continuously" till about midnight.

The immediate success of *Roderick Random* has, of course, always been recognized, but its broadly popular nature is perhaps especially plain in this piece of crude capitalization. Not that the Roderick and Strap of the play are in any particular Smollett's Roderick and Strap; or that the piece, despite a pleasant reference to Tom Bowling (p. 8), is in any way either dependent on or connected with the novel. Rather, the crowning tribute to Smollett would seem to be just the opposite: a touching belief in the drawing power of the bare names of his characters.

Yale University.

HOWARD BUCK.

A NOTE

I greatly regret that Mr. Frank L. Fenton's note in *M. L. N.*, Feb. '27, on "The authorship of Acts III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth*" did not come under my notice in time for me to refer to it in my monograph on the work of Beaumont and Fletcher, just issued by the Yale University Press. Perhaps, in the circumstances, I may be permitted to say a word or two here in regard to it.

Mr. Fenton declares that, though he feels sure that Field wrote, of *Four Plays in One*, the Induction and the first two plays, the

characteristics which mark them out as his and which are so clearly defined in the two plays (*A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*) solely by him are not to be found in the two acts of *The Queen of Corinth* which have also been attributed to him. He is convinced that, "whoever may have written" these two acts, "Field did not."

Mr. Fenton's characterisation of Field's work is entirely sound; but in one conclusion which he draws I venture to disagree with him. Setting Field's average of double endings at about 14%, and of run-on lines at 20%, he treats each of these averages as a maximum. Thus he says, "With the exception of one scene (IV, iii), the percentage of double endings is too high; in this scene it is as low as 12%, which is within his range." It would have been more reasonable to take anything from one-third below to one-half above Field's average as being within his range—that is to say, from 9½ to 21. So regarding the double endings, we find that three of the six scenes give what we might expect from Field, and that three (IV, i, with 40%; IV, ii, with 25%; and IV, iv, with 26%) do not. On a similar basis, the percentage of run-on lines should range from 13½ to 30. All the scenes, on Mr. Fenton's figures, come within the scope in this respect, with the exception of IV, ii, which has 43%.

It is, of course, possible to regard the total percentages for the six scenes (on Mr. Fenton's figures, 24.5 for double endings, and 25.9 for run-on lines) as too high for Field; though it must be borne in mind that the work in *A Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies* is much earlier, and that one expects both percentages to grow with a writer's increased mastery of the art of verse; but Mr. Fenton is not justified in regarding as within the writer's scope only those figures which are below his average. In view of the date of *The Queen of Corinth*, it is anything there which is below the average attained in the early plays, rather than anything above it, that should be regarded with suspicion. We should, I maintain, have a progressive growth in Field's double-ending and run-on percentages from *A Woman is a Weathercock*, through *Amends for Ladies*, *Four Plays in One* (which I believe to date about 1614), and *The Queen of Corinth* (which apparently dates early in 1616, as I show in my book), to *The Fatal Dowry* (which may be set down as of 1617).

University of Virginia.

E. H. C. OLIPHANT.

MR. ALDINGTON REPLIES

Owing to the fact that the International Press-Cutting Agency does not attempt to "cover" learned periodicals, my first knowledge of Professor Bernbaum's article came through the comments in the press. It was only yesterday that through the courtesy of a gentleman in New York I received a copy. You will I am sure, allow me to make some comment by way of reply.

In a letter to the *New York Nation* I have dealt at some length with the question of hostility of collaboration between professors and mere authors. To that letter (if it has been published) I refer your readers. I shall only say here that I think hostility regrettable. Authors have much to learn from professors; perhaps professors have something to learn from authors—is not the art that professors profess the art of knowing authors?

It may surprise you to learn that in censuring me Professor Bernbaum falls into error and shows me that he is not fully or even well acquainted with the *Quinze Joyes de Mariage* and its problems. The paragraphs in which he deals with that work are headed "1475-1600." The Rouen MS. of *Les Quinze Joyes* is dated 1664 and the book was certainly written earlier. Mr. Aldington, the incompetent amateur, would have been more careful. But Professor Bernbaum is either dishonest or has not read the Introduction he censures; and I will prove it. He says:

"The 'List of Books Consulted' omits the most important article on La Salle—Allison Peers's."

Literally, that is true; but on page 48 of my Introduction I say:

"Two recent editions (Dressler, 1903, and Fleig, 1903) are mentioned by Mr. Allison Peers."

On page 7 I say:

"An ample bibliography of the controversy will be found in *Modern Philology*, April, 1916."

If you will turn up the files of *Modern Philology* you will find that this reference is to the article by Mr. Allison Peers. There are two plain references to Mr. Peers's article in my Introduction, and Professor Bernbaum impudently pretends that I was ignorant of it! Is that exact scholarship?

Further, it is not true that Mr. Peers's article is the "best." It is very good and well-informed, but represents a tendency which is now less and less acceptable to French scholars, i. e., it definitely tends to establish La Salle as the author of *Les Quinze Joyes*. There is an excellent and convincing résumé of the case for the other side (in the Bédier and Hasard *Hist. de la Litt. Fr.*) by M. Lucien Foulet, whose admirable work in mediaeval French will certainly be known to you. But, though I was convinced by M. Foulet's arguments, I carefully refrained from uttering a decisive opinion, which must be left to exact scholarship. It would be absurd for me to compare my translation with Dekker's. Professor Bernbaum, however, says that I did not know that Dekker's translation existed. He cannot have read the note on page 46 of my Introduction, where it is mentioned. But does Professor Bernbaum categorically state that because Dekker has translated a 15th century French work, no other translation must be made? Now surely, if he is candid, he will admit that Elizabethan translators, particularly Dekker, are apt to be a little wild and fanciful in their renderings. They often take great liberties with their texts and the texts they used were not produced by exact scholarship. A translation is also a commentary, and I think sufficient time has elapsed since Dekker to render a new translation at least permissible. Professor Bernbaum is contemptuous of my translation. How if I tell you that it has been highly commended, not by a professor of English, but by a professor of Mediaeval French? I quote with gratitude the words of Dr. Eileen Power, whose work on mediaeval life and literature is so well known:

"... I have spent some years in the collection of material on mediaeval ideas about women, and am, moreover, a great admirer of Mr. Aldington's work, for his translation of *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* transfers into English the exact flavour of the original, in a way I should have thought impossible until he did it."

(*New Statesman*, 12. 3. '27.)

Miss Power was good enough to bring her knowledge to bear in a discussion of my book; the fact that she decided against me on the point at issue made her acknowledgement of the worth of my translation the more valuable.

RICHARD ALDINGTON.

PROFESSOR BERNBAUM REBUTS

Both the substance and the methods of Mr. Aldington's diatribes seem to me to furnish further evidence of the amateurish quality of his work. To deal first with the substance, I reply:

1. Any observant reader would notice that in my survey I took up foreign works, not in the period in which they were composed, but in the period in which they were translated into English. Under the heading 1475-1600, I mention works by Heliodorus and Boccaccio. Does Mr. Aldington fancy that I suppose the originals of those works to have appeared in that era? Of *The Fifteen Joys*, there was one translation (verse) in 1509; and one (prose) in 1603.

2. I did not say that Mr. Aldington was ignorant of Professor Allison Peers's article. My point was the carelessness of omitting so important an article from the bibliographical list.—I must now add, what I previously refrained from saying, that Mr. Aldington has not verified his reference: you will *not* find the article in "*Modern Philology*, April, 1916." The April issue is in vol. XIII. The article is in the November issue; vol XIV, p. 405. Moreover, it does not seem true to me that Professor Peers's judicious analysis of the problem "definitely tends to establish La Sale as the author"; and I feel rather sorry for Mr. Aldington if Professor Peers deigns to take up his audacious challenge on that point.

3. I did not say that Mr. Aldington "did not know that Dekker's translation existed." My charge was even graver,—namely that, although he knew it existed, he had not taken the trouble to read it. Accordingly he did not know that the already existing translation was, as I said, "*just such a translation*" as he tried to make. It seemed to me that no true scholar, about to edit *Les Quinze Joyes*, and desirous of seeing it rendered in an archaic style, would fail to look up *The Bachelor's Banquet*.¹

¹On the question of the literary value of Mr. Aldington's translation, which is not germane here, an Oxford scholar wrote to me as follows: "I was very interested to see that you have rebuked Richard Aldington for his impudence in putting into a no-man's English what an Elizabethan has put into good idiomatic English."

Mr. Aldington's methods in controversy are even more instructive illustrations of amateurishness than the frail substance of his letters. When a courteous and well-informed reviewer in "The New Statesman" (19.2.'27) demurred that his hasty generalizations about medieval contempt for women were too sweeping, and quite casually mentioned his "Tennysonian idealism," Mr. Aldington furiously asserted that the reviewer could not have "possessed any direct knowledge of the subject on which he presumed to dogmatize," and sarcastically expressed the suspicion that "Tennyson is his nearest point of contact with what he calls the mediaeval ages." It was in this intemperate letter, as Professor Eileen Power points out, that Mr. Aldington tried to defend his generalization by misusing evidence from Bédier. Quoting the passage wherein Bédier describes the attitude of the *fabliaux* towards women, he falsely suggested that Bédier thought this the attitude of the Middle Ages *in general*.

No reputable scholar makes an attack upon an article that he has not read. Mr. Aldington in "The Nation" (27.7.'27) attacked mine merely on the basis of "comments in the press." Misrepresenting my views, he said I was under "the delusion" that only Ph. D.'s are scholarly (prominent parts of my article pointed out that some Ph.D.'s were just the opposite). Now, after receiving the article, he distorts my meaning in another way. The distinction I drew was not between "professors and authors" (a nonsensical one); but between (a) true scholars, (b) dull pedants, and (c) superficial amateurs. I did not imply that amateurs may not have read much, nor that they may not be delightfully entertaining. What I objected to was that they and their publishers are putting forth hurried and glib work under the pretension that it is scholarly. Mr. Aldington proclaims in "The Nation" that he has written over three hundred articles in eight years! Whenever he takes the time to produce a really scholarly work concerning prose fiction, I shall give it a place of honor in my annual review. My sole desire is to raise, if possible, the level of scholarship in this too amateurishly tilled field.

ERNEST BERNBAUM.

University of Illinois.

REVIEWS

The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse.

By W. J. LAWRENCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. viii + 129.

Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. By W. J. LAWRENCE. Cambridge:

Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. viii + 435.

Students of Elizabethan stagecraft are already much beholden to Mr. W. J. Lawrence for his tireless investigations of esoteric problems of the early theatres. In his latest contributions he continues his efforts to establish what he conceives to be a truthful picture of the public theatre of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. That critics will disagree with many of his contentions goes without saying. None is more aware than Mr. Lawrence of the slight evidence on which much of our knowledge of the Elizabethan theatre is based, and none is so ready as he to confess his own mistakes and errors of judgment. Indeed, his readiness to acknowledge proved error disarms the critic who might otherwise be irritated by his occasional proneness to draw unwarranted conclusions from too scanty or too questionable evidence.

Surely after the studies of Mr. Lawrence, here and previously, professors in their classes might stop emphasizing the crudity of the Shakespearean stage. For if the author does nothing else, he shows that Elizabethan producers had the simple commonsense to make use of all the devices and stage arrangements at their command. These studies discuss the means by which the early players made the most of their stage and theatrical limitations.

Both of Mr. Lawrence's recent books, which are the outgrowth of lectures delivered at Harvard University and Radcliffe College in 1925-1926, retain the lecture form of presentation. In *The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse* he reconstructs the typical playhouse of the day. Although the work is distinctly not a handbook, it provides a valuable synthesis of recent stage research plus Mr. Lawrence's own latest labors in that field. The writer takes up and tries to settle in the light of modern scholarship the complex problems of the arrangement of the stages, front, rear, and upper, the placement of doors, the use of windows, the location of the music room, the use of the garret, the place of the "heavens" or shadow, etc. He believes with reason that from the first Globe onward, the front stage of public playhouses was protected by ornamental balustrades. He also accepts the Archer theory of oblique doors, the reasonable explanation of "opposite" doors on the Elizabethan stage. He concludes that stage doors

could be locked and bolted. He believes, without sufficient evidence, I think, that there was a grating between the rear-stage curtain and the entering door for use in prison scenes and other scenes of like sort. One of Mr. Lawrence's most difficult theories to accept is his belief that the "city gates" (pp. 60 ff.) formed the permanent background of the rear stage. In that case, Samson must have wrought devastation in the playhouse comparable only to that of the Philistine temple when he carried the city gates from the lower to the upper stage in the play mentioned in Middleton's *Family of Love* (I, iii).

At a few points Mr. Lawrence interrupts his exposition with controversial material. He postulates a curtained music room over the rear stage even in the earliest theatres and differs from Sir Edmund Chambers, who agrees to the location of the music room later in the theatres when the room was not being used for spectators or acting. About the vexed question of the relation of the garret, the heavens, and the shadow, Mr. Lawrence concludes that the upper rooms of the tiring house (the room above the music room on the upper stage level, surmounted by the garret) projected to form the heavens from which the gods descended (pp. 115 ff.). Without doubt the shadow or protecting roof over the stage was higher than most critics have believed. It seems more reasonable to me that the garret alone, and not the room over the upper stage level, projected as Mr. Lawrence indicates and formed the peak of the shadow which extended further over the stage. Thus the floor of the garret and its extension formed the heavens which Professor Graves believed were decorated with signs of the zodiac and the heavenly bodies. I can see no reason for the projection of the upper room of the tiring house. The projection of the garret alone would provide an easy means of admitting the creaking throne of the gods, and the greater height of the heavens would prevent obscuring the adjacent galleries.

The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse presents in a brief compass a valuable and carefully documented analysis of important characteristics of the early theatre. In *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* Mr. Lawrence considers some of the more detailed and more speculative problems of the theatre and early drama. He reverts to the old inn-yard theory of theatrical development. He believes that the inn-yards were often equipped with permanent stages and scaffolds, that the public theatres probably derived visible stairs from the inn construction, that plays which do not state on their printed title-pages where or by what company they were acted and which do not call for entrances through doors may reasonably be considered inn-yard plays. Such conclusions, in spite of what the author insists are proofs, seem to me sheer conjecture, interesting if true. Too frequently in this series of studies Mr. Lawrence weakens an otherwise tenable theory by pushing it to

an extreme. His discussion, for example, of the practice of actors' doubling is worthwhile and enlightening, but he is on slippery ground when he insists that no court troupe of professional players from Henry VII to Elizabeth had over four actors and that plays were almost invariably constructed to conform to the four-actor convention. One would like to see more positive proof. Likewise Mr. Lawrence ventures into the realm of conjecture, not always supported by logic, in his chapter on dramatic collaboration. While I freely admit that play writing was a trade, I cannot accept such a statement as ". . . in Shakespeare's day . . . plays were written wholly and solely to order, and . . . they were never ordered until they were wanted" (p. 341). Nor can I see in what conceivable manner Mr. Lawrence reaches a conclusion such as this: "Even when publication was belated and the play had been revised—perhaps more than once—by other hands, the names on the title-page had no other significance than that their bearers had collaborated on the original play" (p. 348). Mr. Lawrence refuses to believe that the name of a reviser, continuator, or editor ever graced (or disgraced) an Elizabethan play title-page.

But these are faults of a worthy treatise. The bulk of the material presented bears evidence of the author's commonsense and sound reasoning. Much of it gives new light on obscure phases of theatrical practice. Mr. Lawrence discusses ably the use and place of stage traps, the method of staging *Hamlet* and the introduction of the ghost through a trap in the contemporary playhouse, the means of procuring sound illusions, bird songs, battle noises, etc., the use of spectacular matter and the procuring of stage realism, the employment of the jig, the rise and popularity of the complex-disguise play, the number and use of stage properties, and a number of other important problems of Elizabethan stagecraft upon which he is equipped to speak as an authority. Indeed, the faults of Mr. Lawrence's book come chiefly from an enthusiasm sometimes to prove more than the facts will bear. Yet such is his acquaintance with the out-of-the-way and abstruse details of the early stage and drama that his conjectures often command a respect beyond the weight of the evidence deduced in proof. Certainly no student of the stage can ignore either of the two latest works by Mr. Lawrence.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Sheridan to Robertson, A Study of the Nineteenth-Century London Stage. By ERNEST BRADLEE WATSON. Harvard University Press, 1926. \$5.00.

Among historians and critics of the drama there are two schools. One considers plays more or less *in vacuo* as works of literary art; the other considers them as histrionic representations linked necessarily with stagecraft. No more valuable contribution in the latter class has been made in two decades than the volume of Professor Ernest Bradlee Watson of Dartmouth. Stagecraft is admittedly his concern in considering a period in the history of the English drama notoriously deficient in literary excellence. Professor Watson, with commendable industry, has delved among forgotten playbills, pamphlets, and newspapers, and sorted out a mass of evidence to show conclusively how the stagecraft of the time must be held responsible for its dramatic mediocrity, and how that stagecraft in turn was shaped by factors social, economic, political—indeed, anything but literary.

The effect of the Theatrical Monopoly, enforced by the Licensing Act of 1737 and continuing until 1843, proved destructive to the English drama. By that Act only two theatres—Drury Lane and Covent Garden—were privileged to present spoken plays. These 'major' theatres were always ready to prosecute the 'minors' for any infraction of privileges. Thus, in 1787, they charged with vagrancy a manager who had put on *As You Like It* at the Royalty Theatre and forced him to substitute dumb show, dancing, and burlettas. As late as 1832, *Othello* was acted as a burletta, with chords struck at intervals on a piano. When the pernicious Monopoly was abolished in 1843, so low had the drama sunk that it did not fully recover for twenty years.

But the Monopoly was only one among many factors that hampered playwrights and managers. Before 1860 no theatre except the Haymarket achieved continuous prosperity. "Certainly at no time in England, and perhaps never elsewhere in the world, did the drama face such long-continued financial calamity," says Professor Watson. Audiences rioted when John Philip Kemble sought to advance his prices but sixpence. Yet managers were forced to present expensive triple bills, to pay large salaries to their stars, to provide costly spectacles, to distribute broadcast complimentary tickets, to allow half-price to late-comers, to spend much money in litigation for and against the Monopoly, and to contend with the neglect and contempt of the upper classes and the active opposition of the clergy.

Esthetically, good drama was throttled by the very conditions of performance. The Monopoly houses were unduly enlarged to accommodate a rabble eager only for melodrama and entertain-

ment of the broadest and most obvious appeal. Audiences were uproarious, hissing the playwright and the actors, vociferous in denouncing any costume they did not like. The lights in the auditorium were never lowered, and the glare from chandeliers was as fatiguing as the hard seats. Since half of all the playhouses and nine of the most important thirteen were close to Charing Cross, and since transportation was difficult, those who attended were principally drawn from a very restricted area and body of citizens. Moreover, except for one royal visit a year to the Patent Houses, theatrical performances were ignored by the upper classes, the opera alone, as given at the King's Theatre, absorbing the attention of the wealthy.

By 1870, however, these deplorable conditions had all been changed. The theatres had become free and self-supporting. The stage, with apron reduced, was well lighted by gas, with 'floats' sunk beneath the floor. The auditorium was equipped with carpets and upholstered seats and stalls. Triple bills had been cut down to double or single, with a consequent shortening of what was before a heterogeneous and physically exhausting performance. The audience had been transformed from an unruly mob to a company of well-bred and intelligent persons prepared to enjoy a quieter and more discriminating style of performance.

Professor Watson follows each step in this happy transformation, tracing the efforts at reform by Vestris, Mathews, the Bancrofts, and Robinson in the 'minor' houses, and the attempts of Macready at the 'majors' to revive poetic drama. He indicates how Sadler's Wells, once devoted to tank melodramas owing to its liberal supply of water, became the home of Shakespearean tragedy; and how melodrama itself, introduced from France in 1802, grew more refined and shared in the drift toward realism fortified by French comedy. He pays particular tribute to Queen Victoria as the first sovereign since Elizabeth to foster dramatic art.

Not the least service of Professor Watson is his placing of Robertson in right relation to tendencies already at work. Robertson, he shows, has been overpraised by Clement Scott for revolutionizing the drama. "Very clearly his work was not independent of the stream of life on the stage. The new French tributary to that stream supplied his dramaturgy; and the new English one, his method of characterization." Even in the matter of stagecraft, Robertson and his able assistants merely brought to a climax a movement set going by others. But they did introduce "a wholly new spirit of coöperation among managers, actors, and playwrights, dominated by a devotion, not to self-interest, not to personal gratification, but to popular art."

In its lack of clear and simple exposition lies the only fault to be found with Professor Watson's treatment of a subject little understood. He might have told his story far more directly. It

is somewhat confused in chronology, cumbrous, and repetitious, and the mass of detail at times threatens to obscure the main outlines. But the book will repay any extra effort required to read and digest it. No one who would comprehend the connection between drama and stagecraft, or stagecraft and the social life of the moment, can afford to neglect this valuable study.

FRANK W. CHANDLER.

University of Cincinnati.

Annals of the New York Stage. By GEORGE C. D. ODELL. New York: Columbia University Press. 2 vols. (Vol. I, to 1798; Vol. II, 1798-1821.) \$17.50.

The period covered by Professor Odell in the first two volumes of his history of the New York stage is that of the early years of the theatre in this country. He begins with the first, and somewhat mythical, accounts of dramatic representations in the colonies and concludes the second volume at the year 1821, the year of the opening of the second Park Theatre, which replaced the old theatre destroyed by fire. The publishers promise a continuation of the *Annals* in subsequent volumes to the year 1910. In the present volumes everything of a theatrical nature, everything that might be called a show, is taken into consideration: pleasure gardens, circuses, concerts, and so on, as well as regular dramatic presentations. From the opening of the John Street Theatre, the days of the Hallams and Douglass, the record is preserved with remarkable fullness and shows unmistakable signs of a prodigious amount of careful work. Professor Odell has worked through many files of old newspapers and has provided the future student with a mass of material that will doubtless prove to be of great value.

The New York stage during the period covered by these volumes was, as everybody knows, a faint echo of the London stage of the same years. The same stock pieces were put on year after year, and Odell's *Annals of the New York Stage* reads much like Genest's *Account of the English Stage*. The story is more or less familiar one, but in these volumes is found a vast amount of new information. As the title of the work indicates, the field is limited to the city of New York, except in the account of the very early years and in incidental references to other cities which are necessary to a complete understanding of the situation in New York. The tale is dreary almost all the way. The earlier actors and managers traveled a rough road, beset by many dangers in the shape of indifference and, at times, active opposition on the part of their prospec-

tive patrons and the city authorities. A success now and then, the triumph of some actor more talented than the others or the glitter of some happily conceived spectacle, adds occasional zest to the telling of an otherwise monotonous review of season after season with the constant recurrence of well worn titles and faces. Among the latter one might mention the Hallams, Douglass, Hodgkinson, Cooper, and Dunlap, the author-manager. To these men we owe the establishment of the New York stage.

Toward the end of the century New York, like London, had its Kotzebue fever; and Dunlap did his bit in pandering to the taste for German sentimentality. Professor Odell is more concerned with the stage than with the plays and he gives more attention to the companies and the casts than to the drama of the time, which, indeed, he does not attempt to discuss except incidentally. The actors are now for the most part forgotten except by the professional student of the American stage, but now and then a great name appears. George Frederick Cooke came to New York in 1810; and ten years later Edmund Kean, then at the height of his powers, showed Americans what first class acting could be and, naturally, made many of them dissatisfied with their own local repertory companies. The managers, like their London contemporaries, fell back upon spectacles when stars were not available; and this state of affairs led to the inauguration of the "star system," the development of which is an important part of our stage history during the years that followed. It will, doubtless, be considered in some detail by Professor Odell in his story of the days of Booth and of Augustin Daly.

A history of the New York stage might serve two purposes. It might provide an interesting account of theatrical activities in the stage capital of the country for the entertainment of the stage struck, or it might present a detailed record of events for the use of the serious student of the American theatre. Professor Odell's monumental work does neither. It is too full of dry facts to be readable from the point of view of the amateur; and, because it scorns the usual and useful, if somewhat cumbersome, paraphernalia of serious scholarship, it is not satisfactory to the student who might find use for it in his investigations. The author of *Annals of the New York Stage* has spent years collecting information of a valuable character. With infinite pains he has searched through old newspapers and playbills and accumulated data innumerable. The labor has been immense; the work is prodigious. But one is unable to see the wood for the trees. It is indeed to be regretted that the method of presentation has probably deprived the work of a good portion of its value. The style, too, is diffuse and colloquial without the charm of pleasant informality. The author frequently announces that he is bored with his task (what does

he expect of his reader?); and his frequent, facetious addresses to the reader are irritating.

The story of the struggles of the early actors and managers against various handicaps should be made an interesting chapter in the history of our national development. It could be so made without sacrifice of scholarship or accuracy. If the chronicler had been content to follow the general practice of scholars and make use of footnotes and appendices, he would have removed many obstructions from his text and provided on the whole a more useful as well as a more readable document. As it is, he gives the impression that he is concerned more with who played what part, down to the obscurest of unknown actors, than with anything else. I do not mean to detract from the praise due him for providing the student profusely with excellent lists of casts; but surely they might have been tabulated at the conclusion of each volume, where they would have been available, and not distributed throughout the text where they are not readily found at a glance and where they seriously interfere with the trend of the reader's thought and serve no useful purpose whatever.

As examples of book-making the two volumes are excellent. They are a joy to look at. The type is clear and pleasing; the illustrations are abundant and excellently reproduced (many of them are from rare prints and engravings in Professor Odell's own collection). The Columbia University Press deserves praise for performing so well a difficult task.

DOUGALD MACMILLAN.

The University of North Carolina.

Beiträge zur Untersuchung der literarischen und stofflichen Quellen von Immermann's "Münchhausen." Von NORBERT GÖKE. Münster i. W: Druck von Ferdinand Theissing, 1924. 215 Seiten.

In the associated fields of literature and philology there are two distinct classes of "research": the contributory, and the repetitive. This dissertation, written by an enthusiastic native of the region concerned, belongs on every count to the first class: it is a contribution.

The facts are these: Immermann has been more widely discussed than any other writer in German literature in proportion to the quite small amount of his work that has survived his death (1840). The reason for this is not wholly to the credit of Germanic scholarship. Doctors *in spe* need themes for dissertations; *Oberlehrer* find it judicious to write on safe topics by way of filling out the first

part of their annual *Schulprogramme*; German publishers are quite generous, in the matter of complete editions,¹ and always eager to combat competition; and seasoned professors can rarely be found unwilling to bring out something on a man of Immermann's type.

What is unique about Immermann as a writer that he should attract all of this critical attention? In the first place, he lived within his own present, and poetized his own age, regardless of the subjects he treated, more than any other German writer. About to launch out on the creation of his *Tristan and Isolde*, which was left a fragment at the time of his death, he wrote: ²

*Horch auf! Hort zu! Ein neues Lied'
Von alter Lust ein heisses Lied!
Gottfried von Strassburg hat's gesungen;
Ich sing' es nach in meiner Zungen.*

And in his prose works he stated that he wished to write "such a *Tristan* as Gottfried would write were he living to-day."

Moreover, he interlarded his fiction, verse as well as prose, more heavily with tempting literary, political, historical, sociological and personal allusions than any other writer in German literature. Others have, of course, done this, but the outstanding cases are Goethe's references to Shakespeare in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, to Homer and others in *Werther*, Schiller's to Johannes Muller in *Wilhelm Tell*, and Grillparzer's to Katharina Fröhlich in *Ottobars Glück und Ende*. But with Immermann this was one of the commonest of practices. In his sociocultural novel entitled *Die Epigonen* (1835) he refers to by name, discusses, makes, virtual characters of no fewer than sixty-one prominent writers, living and dead.³

These two facts, more than his genius, have moved so many men to write about him. And the individual who really started this massive Immermann literature from the point of view of *Münchhausen*, which has been the most fruitful theme, was that industrious publicist, poet and translator Adolf Strodtmann (1829-1879). Three years after Strodtmann's death, in 1882,

¹There are at present five "standard" editions of Immermann's works: *Hempel*, 20 volumes in 8, edited by Boxberger; *Deutsche National-Literatur*, 8 volumes in 4, edited by Max Koch; *Cotta*, 6 volumes, edited by Franz Muncker; *Bibliographisches Institut*, 5 volumes, edited by Harry Mayne; *Bong*, 6 volumes in 3, edited by Werner Deetjen. Each of these editions contains an elaborate life, separate introductions to the various works, and all the aids and devices known to modern scholarship in the way of notes, *Lesarten*, facsimiles and photographs.

²*Cf. Werke*, Hempel edition, vol. XIII, lines 121-124.

³This phase of Immermann has been discussed quite at length in the writer's *Karl Lebrecht Immermann: A Study in German Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911.

his edition of *Munchhausen* appeared in Berlin. Strodtmann made an attempt to locate the places referred to in the novel, and to identify the personages, with especial reference to the *Hofschulze*, the *Sammler*, the *Kuster*, *Oswald* and *Lisbeth*. He was so successful in some of his findings that his followers have been disinclined to query any of them. Dr. Göke, however, has gone into the entire problem with such enviable diligence and intelligence that we can at last regard the subject as a closed issue. And it was worth doing, for Will Vesper was entirely correct when he wrote: *“Munchhausen ist ohne Zweifel der bedeutendste komische Roman unserer Litteratur.”*

Göke divides his treatise into what might be termed the “lie” part, dealing with that incorrigible charlatan Münchhausen, and the “truth” part dealing with the Hofschulze, sturdiest of all Westphalian farmers. As to the first, it has long been known that Immermann was indebted to Furst von Pückler-Muskau’s *Tutti Frutti*.⁴ The surface similarity of the two works is obvious even without investigation. Due, however, it would seem at least, for a reason must be found, to the huge mass of stodgy material that had to be gone through, no one has ever laid the two works down before him and compared them, character for character, action for action, theme for theme, by way of determining the extent to which Immermann followed his model. Göke has done this and has found the complete *Urkeim* of Münchhausen embedded in that section of Pückler’s work known as *Flucht ins Gebirge*.⁵ He has been so successful in truth that it requires no small amount of regional pride to say with him, regarding Immermann, *und trotzdem beugen wir uns vor seinem Genuß*.

This part of this able investigation could have been done in a library; nor is Göke the first to have undertaken it. Franz Sintenis⁷ essayed the same task, with mediocre success, in 1875. Nor did it require strictly original research to determine the extent to which Immermann leaned on Justus Möser,⁸ Kindlinger,⁹ Paul

⁴ Cf. *Munchhausen: eine Geschichte in Arabesken*. Herausgegeben von Will Vesper. München: Martin Mörikes Verlag, 1913. Page 4.

⁵ The complete title is: *Tutti Frutti. Aus den Papieren des Verstorbenen*. The work appeared at Stuttgart in 1834, in five volumes.

⁶ Cf. Pages 13-270 of vol. II of the complete work.

⁷ Cf. *Ueber Immermanns “Munchhausen” und Goethe und Furst Pückler-Muskau*. Von Franz Sintenis. Dorpat. 1875.

⁸ Cf. *Patriotische Phantasien*. Göke attributes not a little of the general spirit of Immermann’s leading characters, with especial reference to the fondness of the Hofschulze for traditions and fixed usages, to Möser’s writings.

⁹ Cf. *Münsterische Beiträge zur Geschichte Deutschlands, hauptsächlich Westfalens, 1787-1793*. Göke makes a very strong case for Kindlinger, whose work Immermann knew and from which he had taken notes. His dissertation is in very bad form here, however, for, as is so frequently

Wigand,¹⁰ Geck,¹¹ J. F. L. Sybel,¹² L. F. von Schmitz and Freiligrath. It merely required time to go through their relevant works, and patience to sift the wheat from the chaff now that it has all been thrashed out by the legions of Immermann students, including the last and most lengthy, Harry Maync.¹³

As to the part played by von Schmitz—Göke has gone into that in definite detail. We may pass over his argument with the sole remark that he has depicted, for the first time, the life and works of this remarkable character. Nor need we dwell long on Freiligrath other than to raise a question: Would it be safe or critical to ask whether Freiligrath was capable of disingenuousness? That he was a friend, or at least an acquaintance, of Immermann has long been well established. But Göke surprises us somewhat by the observation that hardly had Immermann died, suddenly and unexpectedly—Freiligrath survived him by thirty-six years—when Freiligrath came forward with the assertion that he himself was the original of the *Jäger in Münchhausen*.

Thus far the problem has been largely literary. When we go over to the "truth" part of *Munchhausen* we enter a vastly more important field, for this part deals with what is known, rather unfortunately, as *Der Oberhof*, of which Richard M. Meyer said rightly:¹⁴ *Es ist nicht die erste Dorfgeschichte, aber das erste realistische Landschaftsbild grossen Stils in Deutschland*. The problem was simple, though it has been made quite complicated by students of literary history who somehow or other were unwilling to study the problem on the grounds. Immermann pictured a farm

the German custom, Kindlinger is referred to at great length, as though even the specialized reader knew something about him. Not even his baptismal name is given. It is an annoyance that one meets often in German treatises. Nikolaus [Venantius] Kindlinger was born in 1749, died in 1819, and is regarded as the father of historical investigation in the Münster field.

¹⁰ Cf. *Das Fehmgericht Westphalens, u. s. w.* Von Paul Wigand. Hamm: 1825. According to Göke, this work was *hochbedeutsam für Immermann* in his description of the *Fehmgericht*, the Ku Klux Klan of that time, and the sword of Charlemagne.

¹¹ Cf. *Topographisch-historisch-statistische Beschreibung der Stadt Soest*. Von Arnold Geck. Soest: 1825. Göke feels that the work had but very little influence on Immermann, though he had studied it and possibly derived from it his conception of the *Richter in Münchhausen*, though it is well to bear in mind that Immermann himself was a Judge.

¹² A preacher who also wrote (1793), father of Immermann's friend of like name, and grand-father of Heinrich von Sybel the historian. Göke feels that Immermann may have derived some suggestions for his *Prediger* from him and his activity.

¹³ Maync devotes no fewer than seventy pages of his *Immermann* (1920: 627 pages) to *Munchhausen*. The Pückler-Muskau theme is treated but briefly.

¹⁴ Cf. *Die deutsche Literatur des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 3rd. ed. page 128.

and life on that farm in Westphalia, in the environs of Soest. The thing then is simple: the farm buildings of that part of Germany have changed very little in the last ninety years and the landscape has changed not at all. Goke took Immermann's *Oberhof* in his hands and studied the lay of the land. He concludes: *Einen bestimmten Hof in der vom Dichter ungefähr bezeichneten Gegend vom Standpunkte der Heimat, des Bodens aus anzugeben, ist uns nicht gelungen.* It is as important a piece of work as was done recently at Harvard with regard to the death of Christopher Marlowe.

He then furnishes every evidence available to substantiate the claims of the Heinrich Ewald *Hof* at Meckingsen as the model of the *Hof* and Heinrich Ewald himself as the original of *Der Hofschulze*. The identification of the other characters is undertaken with equal thoroughness and the conclusions reached are framed in equally cautious language. Goke is certain in only one case: that of Joseph Beyer and the *Hauptmann*. He feels that Beyer was the original, though even here he appends a note in which he says that it is highly probable that Immermann, who visited the region as a young soldier in the War of Liberation, and then again in 1831, knew Captain von Seydewitz, the one who is usually regarded as the original of the *Hauptmann*, personally.

In so far as the identification of characters and places is a valuable part of literary study, this is a valuable study. Nothing in it is taken for granted; no predecessor is looked upon as an authority; great bundles of church, army, and family archives were opened for the first time and read; and the landscape itself was looked over as carefully as if it were to be surveyed incident to a transfer of title.

In 1871, F. Holtze published at Berlin a *Schulprogramm* of approximately 1,600 words entitled *Padagogisches aus Immermann*. This pamphlet is not included in any of the many Immermann bibliographies; it is not even listed in Goedeke.¹⁵ This is one remarkable feature of it. The other is the correctness of the estimate given in it of Immermann as a man. Holtze¹⁶ wrote:

Der Grundzug I'scher Individualität und Dichtung ist der Trieb zur Wahrheit. Es ist ausser Goethe wohl kein anderer deutscher Dichter, der mit solchem Ernste ihr nachginge, mit so grossem Eifer sie predigte, ihren Segen mit solcher Freudigkeit verkündigte. . . . Das Eigenthümliche solcher Wahrheitsliebe ist aber, dass der Begriff der Lüge . . . bei ihm zugleich alles Einseitige und Extreme umfasst. Die Vereinigung des Verstandes mit der Phantasie, des Intellectuellen mit dem Moralischen, ist der innerste Kern seines Wesens . . . Er erblickt die Lüge vor Allem in dem Abgehen von der Natur. . . .

¹⁵ Cf. Goedeke's *Grundriss*. Bd. VIII., S. 592-621.

¹⁶ Cf. *Padagogisches aus Immermann*. Von F. Holtze. Berlin: Druck von J. Petsch, 1871, S. 50.

Truer words have never been spoken with regard to Karl Immermann, though he was anything in the world but a J. J. Rousseau. He loathed falseness in all its forms and tried to run it down, in his fiction, but largely with the aid of other peoples' critical and creative works. He never achieved success until he decided to discard his *Hilfsmittel* and go out in the open. This explains his *Münchhausen*¹⁷ as a whole, the success of *Der Oberhof*,¹⁸ and his well-nigh unique type of immortality.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD.

West Virginia University .

L'Abbé d'Aubignac, la Pratique du Théâtre, nouvelle édition avec des corrections et des additions inédites de l'auteur, une préface et des notes. Par PIERRE MARTINO. Algiers, Carbonnel; Paris, Champion, 1927. xxx + 440 pp.

If Euripides could have read Aristotle, or Plautus Castelvetro, they might have found some justification for their general manner of writing, but few answers to the questions they would have been most likely to put. This reproach cannot be addressed to d'Aubignac, who was the first critic of the stage to accompany his generalizations with abundant comments upon details and a wealth of illustrations, drawn from contemporary as well as ancient productions. Narrow and unimaginative he often seems, but he knew the plays of his day better than he knew his breviary and his observations are of great value to the student of the French stage. It is, therefore, an important service that M. Martino has rendered in making the *Pratique du théâtre* more accessible to the public. The edition of 1657 is found in few libraries; that of 1715 neither

¹⁷ The first edition of *Münchhausen*, in the possession of the writer, appeared in four volumes. The pages are as white, unfaded and clean to-day as they were in 1838 when the first volume appeared, or 1839 when the last three appeared. The work was published by J. E. Schaub, Düsseldorf.

¹⁸ The writer has been attempting for years to make a complete collection of the many different editions of *Der Oberhof*. A study might well be made of the evolution of interest in *Oberhof*, if for no other reason because nothing like it can be referred to in the case of any other German writer. German editors are not all agreed as to what constitutes the "Oberhof" sections of *Münchhausen*. Wilhelm Wagner's edition consists of 83 pages; Hanns Holzschuher's edition consists of 377 pages. Immermann himself would be surprised and disturbed at the existence of any of them. And now come two Swedish translations: Karl Immermann: *Fogdegaarden. Översatt från Tyskan* av Ragnar Hallqvist, Ahlen & Åakerlund, Stockholm, 318 pages, 1925; and Karl Immermann: *Gammelgaarden*, Översättning av Axel Ringström, Norstedt & Söner, Stockholm, 455 pages, 1925.

reproduces the original accurately nor includes the notes added by the Abbé to a copy of it which he was preparing for a second printing. M. M. has given us these notes, including a whole chapter with a reference to Molière, and has pointed out the cases in which d'A., moved to wrath against Corneille, struck out the compliments he had paid him in the first edition. He has also sketched, in a necessarily superficial preface, the history of the French stage before the *Pratique* was written and has elucidated in his notes most of d'A.'s references to French plays.

It might have been well to comment also upon the classical references and to point out to what extent the critic's ideas were found in the works of his predecessors. Had he done so, M. would hardly have written that the *Pratique* is "de pur style Louis XIII" and has no connection with the tragedy of Racine (p. xiii), for d'A.'s conception of the unities is much closer to the practice of Racine than it is to that of the generation that preceded his and there are other respects in which he is nearer to Racine than to Corneille.¹ The dates of publication of a few plays (p. 399, 401, 403) should be corrected as follows: *Alcionée*, 1640; *Bradamante*, 1637; *Mort de Bradamante*, 1624; *Trompeur puni*, 1633; *Frères rivaux*, 1637. He has himself corrected (p. xiv) the date assigned to *Virginie* on p. 419. M. Fransen² has proved that Bellerose was a member of the troupe he afterwards led as early as 1622, not 1628 (p. 401), and that Vautrel, whose name M. M. writes Veautray or Vautret, had retired from the stage before 1620 (p. 418). The troupe to which they both belonged was known as the Comédiens du Roy long before 1639 (p. ix). Fourteen authors are referred to (p. ix) as if they began to write in 1630, but at that time one of them was dead and at least six had already produced a play. Two, moreover, did not begin to write till several years later. Actors not infrequently remained within the compartments of the stage while playing their parts (p. vi). One cannot attribute to d'A. the invention of the tragedy in prose, for La Serre had employed it as early as 1630 (p. xxiii). D'A.'s *Pucelle d'Orléans* was rewritten in verse by Benserade *or*, not *and* (p. xxiii), La Mesnardière.

M. M. makes out (pp. xiv, xv) an important list of the French plays to which d'A. refers, but it is not altogether satisfactory. When the critic mentions "cette Histoire des trois Freres et des trois Sœurs, dont les amours sont decrites dans l'*Astrée*" (p. 290), M. notes (p. 400) that Rayssiguier had written a tragi-comedy on that subject in 1633, but he fails to observe that d'A. must have been thinking of this play rather than of the story as told in the *Astrée*, for in that novel the six brothers of three women are repre-

¹ Cf. R. Bray, *la Formation de la doctrine classique en France*, Paris, Hachette, 1927, pp. 212, 285.

² *Les Comédiens français en Hollande*, Paris, Champion, 1925, pp. 49, 60.

sented, while Rayssiguier has only three. When d'A. refers to a modern author who had made the mistake

de faire paroistre des gens sur un bastion, agissans et parlans avec leurs ennemis qui estoient au pied, et en suite d'avoir fait prendre la place par ce même bastion, qu'on ne vit ny attaqué ny deffendu (p. 104),

M. concludes (p. 401) that he is speaking of Auvray's *Dorinde*, but this cannot be the case, for in *Dorinde* the city is not captured and the audience does see the bastion both attacked and defended. The reference is probably to a better known play, *l'Amour tyrannique* of Scudéry, in which a conversation between persons on the wall and the besiegers at its foot is followed by the beginning of an assault. The actual fighting takes place behind the scenes and we learn in the second act that the town has been taken. As d'A. refers four times to the simultaneous representation on the stage of France and Denmark, or to action that passes from one of these countries to the other (pp. 31, 99, 101, 209), he seems to have had in mind a definite play. M. suggests (p. 403) Scudéry's *Trompeur puni* and Beys's *Frères rivaux*, but the latter play cannot have been meant, for the scene of it is laid in Denmark only. As for the former, the sea is represented and the action passes to Denmark from another country, but this other country is not France, but England. It is possible that d'A. may have forgotten the latter fact and that he had Scudéry's play in mind, but the identification is not certain. Finally M. fails to mention Rotrou's *Captifs*, to which d'A. refers (p. 339). I conclude from these facts that *Dorinde* and the *Frères rivaux* should be removed from the list, the *Captifs* added to it, *le Trompeur puni* retained, but accompanied by a question mark, and that it should be indicated that d'A. also probably refers to *l'Amour tyrannique* and Rayssiguier's *Palinice*.

The need for these changes does not prevent the book, as it stands, from furnishing much valuable information to all students of the drama.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

The History of John Bull. For the first time faithfully re-issued from the original pamphlets, 1712, together with an investigation into its composition, publication and authorship. By DR. H. TEERINK. Amsterdam, 1925; H. J. Paris.

This is a useful scholarly edition. The text is well-edited and the introduction of distinct value. Dr. Teerink undertakes to prove

* Marsilly, moreover, is in Forez, not "sur le Rhône," though that river and a tower at Lyons are also represented in *Dorinde*.

that "no other person than Swift could have written the work, and that it would be absurd to persist in calling Arbuthnot the author." For this revolutionary thesis he advances a good deal of evidence, none of which is entirely conclusive, much of which is flimsy; but he succeeds in creating a strong supposition that Swift wrote a considerable part of *John Bull*, if not the whole.

The customary attribution of *John Bull* to Arbuthnot rests chiefly upon Swift's positive assertions in the *Journal to Stella*: "It was a Scotch gentleman, a friend of mine, that writ it;" and, later, "Dr. Arbuthnot, the author of *John Bull*." Till now, scholars have generally accepted these phrases at face-value, because, although Swift often playfully mystified Stella as to his authorship of political pamphlets, he seldom if ever told her a direct lie. But quite possibly he did not expect to deceive her by the phrases quoted. A previous entry in the journal seems a deliberate warning: "I went to Ld. Masham's tonight and Lady Masham made me read to her a pretty 2 penny pamphlet, called the St. Alban's Ghost. I thought I had writ it myself; so did they; but I did not." What else can this be except a veiled intimation that he was indeed the author of *St. Alban's Ghost*? From such a hint, could not Stella be trusted to guess the truth, in spite of a negative intended to deceive hostile spies in the post-office? The negatives in regard to *John Bull* may well be similar. We may certainly conjecture that the Tory ministers wanted Arbuthnot, rather than Swift, to bear the blame of *John Bull*, and that they took all necessary measures to make a false ascription permanently credible.

The internal evidence adduced by Dr. Teerink is too long to summarize here. Separately, the items are of little weight; collectively, they are quite impressive. In plan, purpose, and style, *John Bull* obviously resembles the known work of Swift: the political views, the arguments, and the allegory are much in his vein. Yet we may doubt whether this resemblance extends as far as Dr. Teerink believes. Especially in humorous characterization, *John Bull* differs enough from *Gulliver* and *The Tale of the Tub* to suggest that another satirist (and a very able one) was at least part-author, not only of casual ideas, but of the manuscript. If we could be sure that Arbuthnot composed, verbally, many passages in the *Memoirs of Scriblerus*, I should conclude that he did so in *John Bull*. Unhappily, however, we cannot be certain that Arbuthnot wrote *Scriblerus* or anything else generally published under his name, except a few letters and treatises wherein the style offers no criterion for judging his imputed literary powers.

H. M. DARGAN.

Dartmouth College.

Honoré d'Urfé, l'Astrée, nouvelle édition publiée sous les auspices de la "Diana." Par H. VAGANAY, préface de L. MERCIER. Lyons, Masson, 1925-1927. xxviii + 492 + 570 + 714 pp.

Du Nouveau sur l'Astrée. Par MAURICE MAGENDIE. Paris, Champion, 1927. 463 pp.

An intimate knowledge of the *Astrée* is not likely to become again, as it was in the seventeenth century, a necessary part of a gentleman's equipment, but scholars who refuse to acquire more than a superficial acquaintance with it can no longer give the excuse that it is difficult to examine the text and that no substantial study of it exists. Of the dozen books and articles devoted to d'Urfé's novel in the last twenty years the most important, not excepting the *Vie et œuvres d'Honoré d'Urfé* by O. C. Reure, are M. Vaganay's publication of the *Astrée* and M. Magendie's extensive and erudite discussion of it. The first of these will, when completed, make the novel readily accessible. Three of the five parts have already appeared in three handsome volumes, printed clearly on excellent paper and ornamented with reproductions of the original engravings. Unfortunately it is not a variorum edition and is not accompanied by any bibliographical discussion or explanation of why he ignores the original edition of Part I, yet seems to reproduce that of Part II.¹ It is to be hoped that the lacking information will be supplied when the remaining parts of the novel are published.

M. Magendie's work is important for the following reasons: he gives a more satisfactory bibliographical account of the *Astrée*, including the parts added by Baro and Gaubertin than had hitherto been attempted; he shows how little foundation there is for the identification of the characters with the author, his wife, and other persons; he studies in greater detail than anyone else the historical and literary sources of the book, the extent to which it reflects the thought and manners of the times, and its influence on the literature and the society of the years that followed its publication. The books that exerted the largest influence upon it are, perhaps, the *Diana* of Montemayor, the *Bergeries de Juliette* of Nicolas de Montreux, and Fauchet's *Antiquitez gauloises*, but many others are mentioned by M. M., including Cervantes's *Galatea* and Sidney's *Arcadia*, Vergil, Ovid, late Greek novelists and Italian dramatists, Jean Lemaire, Noël Talepied, etc., though he does not claim to have exhausted the possibilities. Excellent chapters are concerned

¹ To judge by the reprint of the frontispiece. Magendie, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-42, shows the importance of the variants found in the edition of Part I that appeared in 1607. The text of Part I published by Vaganay in the *Bibliotheca Romanica* is not identical with that given in his new edition.

with the author's ideas and the relation of his book to its *milieu*. The chapter devoted to its literary influence is less satisfactory. M. M. points out some interesting resemblances to later classical authors, but he makes no attempt to be complete. In discussing, for instance, the plays that derived their plots from the *Astrée*, he merely selects a few of those listed by the abbé Reure, makes a few corrections to his predecessor's statements, a few observations that are open to criticism.² Why he takes these plays rather than others and makes no effort to add other plays to Reure's list he does not tell us.

A more serious fault lies in his failure to examine certain recent works on the *Astrée*. Even though he might not have found much information in the dissertations of Dr. Fischer and Sister Mary McMahon, he should have referred to them, as well as to the article of E. Droz in *R. H. L.*, xxviii (1921). It was still more important to have read M. Bochet's *l'Astrée, ses origines, son importance dans la formation de la littérature classique*, a Geneva dissertation, published in 1923 and mentioned in the preface to Vaganay's edition of the *Astrée*, which M. has seen. It is true that M.'s book is far superior to that of Bochet, but the two have a good deal in common and a few sources are indicated by the latter that M. had overlooked. If M. had read these publications, his own book would have profited, even though its title might have seemed less justified. He would still have had reason to feel he was making an ample contribution to the subject.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Shakespeare Studies.¹ By ELMER EDGAR STOLL. The Macmillan Company, New York: 1927.

This is a vigorous and stimulating book made up of eight studies, two of which are new, the other six, as the writer says, "recast and enlarged." The writer's wide acquaintance with the literature of the ancients and moderns enables him to compare and contrast Shakespeare in many cases with entertaining and sometimes with enlightening results. Perhaps its chief virtue is that it puts the

² He declares (p. 441) that "rien ne fait prévoir" the king's change of heart at the end of *Chryseïde*, although I have pointed out in my edition of the play (p. 25) that such preparation is made. He entirely fails to appreciate the importance and the interest of Mareschal's *Hylas*. On p. 257 he attributes the *Chaste Bergère* to Raphaël du Petitval, who was its publisher, not its author.

¹ Reviewed favorably, T. L. S. Sept. 1, 1927, p. 589; *Beiblatt Zur Anglia*, Oct. 1927, pp. 1 ff.

old time type of Shakespearean to his plunges, forcing him to justify his body of traditionally received opinion as to Shakespeare's qualities of greatness.

The book is weakened by Professor Stoll's eternal belligerency. The writer hurls a bomb at pretty much everything on the Shakespearean horizon. As one reads it, he recalls someone's impression of the main character in a "peppy" American novel of the great west, "a hero who vaulted on his horse and rode violently off in every direction." As he turns the pages the uninformed reader gets the impression from the writer's manner of expression that this sort of criticism is new, that all this lambasting of idols, has never gone on before. One must remember, however, that this practice is coming now to be rather the conventional short cut to literary fame among historians, novelists, and critics. And particularly as regards Shakespeare, if one is not already aware of the fact, he may find in one of Karl Young's² valuable studies that a sizable body of scholars has handled Shakespeare without gloves before now—Rymer, Dryden, Rowe, Gildon, Pope, Hammer, Johnson, J. M. Robertson, Robert Bridges. The manner is new, but the thing is ancient.

The writer's style, throughout apparently designed always to startle and surprise, is rather too clever to serve as a medium of exchange in literary discussions concerned with the ascertainment of literary truths. It leads the writer time and again into wild contradictions. His delight in radical departures from the ordinary beaten paths of approach to Shakespeare leads him into extravagances even more wild.

Any of the chapters in the book will illustrate the impossible extremes to which the writer rushes driven by these two forces—love of rhetoric and heroic iconoclasm. Perhaps his chapter on "Literature and Life" serves best as an illustration. Hitting upon the fallacy, half fallacy, prevalent among scholars that the literature of an age reflects the actual conditions of that age, Professor Stoll "ransacks the ages, spoils the climes" for examples of literary works which illustrate the fact that literature is not a reflection of life, but rather "the reflection of a reflection," "a shadow's shadow" merely, as Hamlet would say. Rushing away from absurd extremes, he falls into others quite as absurd and would conclude that literature is seldom, if ever, a reflection of contemporary life. "Even the morality of the marital relations as in *Othello* are stage morals," says he (p. 72). "Shakespeare's characters bare their passions, even as they expound their own moral qualities quite unnaturally" (p. 75). And so on in other

² "Samuel Johnson, on Shakespeare: One Aspect," *Studies by Members of the Department of English*, Series 3 (University of Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit., no. 8), pp. 146 ff.

chapters *ad infinitum* as to the unnaturalness of Shakespeare's character reactions. "Shakespeare is nature cry the critics still," he cries out derisively (p. 401). "It is idle to accumulate historical and psychological lore to justify" the theory that literature is life, he says (p. 73), and then accumulates an amazing mass of this forbidden lore to prove exactly the opposite. Not once does he seem to reckon with the common sense fact that not in this age nor in that, but in all ages, there is a percentage, how small or how large no man knows, of women who do faint, a certain proportion of husbands, fine fellows too, who like Othello, are unaccountably jealous without cause, a certain proportion of men and women who do "lay bare their passions" quite naturally, only "quite unnaturally" to the oversophisticated reader, and that Shakespeare had the horse sense to realize that these make just about the most enduring stuff possible for effective and successful drama. "Literature and Life" concerns itself too little with Shakespeare to be classed as one of the Shakespeare Studies. Its fifty-seven pages fail to convince against the brief pronouncement of a part only of a sentence of Hamlet that the drama "shows the very age and body of the time his form and pressure."

It is in "Literature and Life," also, that Professor Stoll runs into other strange contradictions. Brilliantly he ridicules the scholar who is always seeking to find Shakespeare himself or other actual people in the plays.—Shakespeare himself in Prospero or King James in Bottom (pp. 78, 85 ff), refers to that impression which "we like most men have been given of fairness and serene impartiality pervading all the plays" (p. 80), and then hot on the trail of some quarry, proceeds himself to find Shakespeare in this and that character of the plays when it serves the purpose of his argument:

"Shakespeare is in full accord with Henry V as he casts his fellows out of his company and out of his mind to meet their end maybe in the brother or the gallows" (p. 300).

"Coriolanus is unfortunate and at fault, but we know that the poet is with him. We know that the poet is not with Shylock" (p. 263).

Nor is one impressed by the logic of statements like the following:

"Least of all is there any hero weak of will. Richard II and Edward II are only apparent exceptions. Though pitied and censured—they are not *irresolute*, [italics mine] not pusillanimous or feeble" (p. 104). Of Richard II, thirty-four pages following:

"... his *resolutions* [italics mine] collapse before the task. . . impotently reflective" (p. 138).

"Mercutio dies scolding but jesting still"; (p. 143).

"No noble or respectable character of his drama dies jesting or laughing." (p. 183).

All in all, there is a deal of good scholarly material in the book.

But while often starting from sound premises the writer often arrives finally at most amateurish conclusions, conclusions which will make their appeal as time goes on only to the amateur and the uninitiated among Shakespeareans. The writer's unbounded faith in the superiority of the modern mind over the Elizabethan is his fatal handicap. The cheek flushes, the style glows at each mention of it. "They [the Elizabethans] loved it [life] as well as we, but not like us, from principle and as a tenet of their faith" (p. 474). "How shallow and obsequious of us to bow to Shakespeare and almost all the choice and master spirits in drama and in fiction up to the present age . . . We ourselves know better" (p. 362). With such a bias, no scholar steeped though he may be, to the point of super-saturation in the learning of the Elizabethan age, can in common sense hope to interpret rightly the greatest of the Elizabethans.

GEORGE COFFIN TAYLOR.

The University of North Carolina.

The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M.D., Collected and Edited by
EDWARD S. NOYES, Cambridge, Harvard University Press,
1926. Pp. xviii + 260.

Few students of mid-eighteenth century English literature but have had cause at one time or another to lament the fragmentary and often contradictory state of our knowledge concerning the life and works of Tobias Smollett. Even the basic information contained in his letters has not been fully utilized because no systematic effort has hitherto been made to collect and edit them. It is to prepare the way for an adequate study of Smollett that Professor Noyes, after much inquiry, has assembled all the available Smollett letters, placed them chronologically, and appended copious notes explaining them.

Smollett obviously disliked letter writing. Hence, when he wrote at all, he was brief and pointed, with no eye for publication. Thus, though he corresponded with John Wilkes, Hume, Garrick, Richardson, and Dr. Johnson, he seldom got beyond business or charity; and his letters, in consequence, throw no revolutionary light upon his career. But, as Professor Noyes points out in his Introduction (p. xv), they do clarify and establish some important facts concerning his literary activity, his financial straits, his health, and his relationship with Wilkes and others.

Here is a well-organized and usable piece of work, as one can readily see by comparing it with Lewis Melville's *Life and Letters of Smollett* (1926). Mr. Melville alludes to or quotes but 37 of

the 60 odd Smollett letters already in print. Owing (in part, at least) to the deficiencies in his sources are the many errors and omissions in his version of the letters. In letter 12 (herein all references to letters by number are to Noyes) Melville gives the name of the well-known bookseller, Dodsley, as Dudley. Letter 53, to Garrick, he dates 1761 instead of 1762. And his text of letters 31, 34, 38, and others have important errors and omissions.¹ Professor Noyes, on the other hand, has a total of 74 letters. Through a careful tracing of manuscripts, moreover, he has secured a dozen letters never before printed,² has made additions to thirteen others, and, in general, has corrected errors which had crept into the earlier printings.

But that Professor Noyes's text of Smollett's letters is complete or even accurate cannot be maintained. In the first place, he omits the important (and the earliest known) letter to Dr. William Hunter—that of 23 August, 1757.³ And though he has lately printed a Smollett letter discovered after the publication of his book, he still makes no mention of this one.⁴ Like Letter 58, it indicates that in August, 1757, Smollett was under considerable obligation (perhaps financial) to Dr. Hunter,—a fact which strengthens Professor Noyes's suspicion that Letter 56 may have been written several years before 1762.

Following manuscript sources largely inaccessible to the reviewer, Professor Noyes is safe from overclose scrutiny of his text; but wherever collation has been possible, disturbing inaccuracies prove frequent. Checking his and Whitridge's versions of Letter 44 with Garnett and Gosse's facsimile reprint of the manuscript (which both Noyes and Whitridge follow), I discover that, whereas Whitridge's text is correct to the last comma and capital letter, Professor Noyes's has the following errors: "enfeebled" for "an invalid" (line 1); a dash and a small "n" instead of a period and a capital "n" (line 10); a small "m" instead of a capital (beginning of line 13); and an unauthorized comma after "would" (last line).⁵ And, what is stranger still, he does not even transcribe correctly the letter (63) reproduced in facsimile as the frontispiece of his own book, having entirely omitted the italicized clause from

¹ Melville, pp. 114, 155, 159, 161, 162.

² Although Professor Noyes claims fifteen new letters, he does not make allowance for those appearing in Arnold Whitridge's *Tobias Smollett* (1925). It should be noted that Mr. Whitridge has published all the Smollett letters to Wilkes, and that in setting in a clearer light the relationship of the two men he has anticipated Noyes.

³ See Melville, p. 160. I can find no other authority for this letter. It is not mentioned in the *British Medical Journal*, 22 Oct., 1904, from which Noyes quotes the other letters to Hunter.

⁴ *Modern Language Notes*, April, 1927, p. 231.

⁵ Garnett and Gosse, *History of English Literature*, III, p. 324; Arnold Whitridge, *Tobias Smollett*, p. 127; Noyes, p. 62.

the following sentence of the second paragraph: ". . . but, as Lord Hertford may from his peculiar benevolence of disposition, take the trouble of writing again to Mr. Neville on this subject, and I am unwilling to trouble his Lordship with a third letter, I shall take it as a very singular favour," etc.

In others of the letters to Wilkes, Professor Noyes and Mr. Whitridge, both following the manuscripts, differ frequently in punctuation, capitalization, and even paragraphing.⁶ In Letter 43 Noyes transcribes "Akenside" where Whitridge (p. 126) has "Ashmoule." Though Whitridge may be in error here (as he certainly is in giving *Sol Atticum* for *Sal Atticum*, in the same letter), one cannot, in the light of Noyes's inaccurate transcriptions of Letters 44 and 63, confidently trust his version of Letter 43. One suspects other flaws; as, for instance, the omission of "yet," where the construction clearly demands it and where Melville gives it, in the opening line of Letter 19; and the repetition (*Monsr. Monsr.*) near the close of Letter 70.⁷

It is improbable that any of the errors cited herein are sufficiently misleading to do serious harm; yet they cast a shadow of suspicion over the whole of Professor Noyes's text of the letters, and prevent its being used with the confidence which it otherwise deserves.

A. W. SECORD.

University of Illinois.

Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Ein Überblick. Von FRIEDRICH VON DER LEYEN. München, F. Bruckmann, 1926. M. 5.

To offer within a small booklet of about 55,000 words a complete survey of German literature is no mean task. The author has accomplished it most successfully, not only presenting the development of literary forms and ideas as they grow and change within fifteen centuries, but at the same time showing them in their relations to similar currents in the correlated spiritual realms of religion, philosophy, and music and tracing them to their sources of energy in the life of Germany's regional peculiarities or to outside influence of her respective neighbors. The secret of such remarkable condensation lies in the fact that the historiographer nowhere stops to give mere biography or static description. Every work and its writer are considered only as producers and receivers of dynamic forces characteristic of their age and nation and con-

⁶ Compare their versions of Letters 41 and 54: Noyes, pp. 58, 73; Whitridge, pp. 125, 129.

⁷ Melville, p. 238.

tributing to the formation of a national literature. A few examples may illustrate the success of Professor von der Leyen's technique:

Man beachte wohl, gerade die deutsche volkstümliche und religiöse Dichtung: *Remmeke Fuchs*, *Till Eulenspiegel*, *Faust*; Sebastian Brant, Seuse drangen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert über die Bezirke Deutschlands hinaus und befruchteten die Dichtung anderer Länder, das war der höfischen Dichtung der Blutezeit nicht beschieden (p. 56).

Der Spielmann, in Deutschland verschwunden, kehrte von England zurück und verpflanzte sich auf seinen alten Boden, das Theater. Unter dem Einfluss der englischen Komodianten versucht sich Ayser an weit-schichtigen Dramen, er holt seine Themen aus den Volksbüchern und versucht sich auch am Singspiel. Aber die Entwicklung des Fastnachtspiels geht mit ihm zu Ende, die Knappheit und der Witz des Hans Sachs waren diesem Nachfahr auch nicht gegeben (p. 58).

Im 11. Jahrhundert hat eine mächtige geistliche Bewegung, Weltabkehr und Welteroberung zugleich, das kirchliche Leben und die deutsche Dichtung erneuert. Im Kampfe zwischen Kaiser und Pabst, zwischen Weltlichem und Geistlichem blieb die deutsche Dichtung geistlich, eine grosse Einheit und ein Abbild der Kultur der Kirche. Das im 11. Jahrhundert Begonnene bildete sich bis in das 15. weiter. Im 16. Jahrhundert bemächtigte sich eine neue geistliche Bewegung unseres Volkes. Sie kam nicht vom Westen zu ihm, sie erhob sich aus seinen Tiefen, sie galt weniger der Menschheit als dem einzelnen Menschen, und sie brachte nicht Einheit sondern Zerkloffung und endlich einen furchtbaren Krieg. Aber das Unheil, das sie für das 16. und 17. Jahrhundert heraufbeschwor, verwandelte sich im 18. in unsre grosse Philosophie, in unsre grosse Musik und in unsre grosse Dichtung (p. 65).

Zur Dichtung von 1630-1750 gehört auch eine gewisse Pedanterie und eine Freude an sichern Regeln; beides fand an Opitz reichliche Nahrung. Man mag nun die Wendung ins Fremde beklagen, die der schlesische Kunstrichter herbeiführte, bedenkt man aber, dass die Maasse der antiken Oden die Maasse Klopstocks und Hölderlins wurden, der fünf Fussige Jambus der Vers unseres klassischen Dramas; erinnert man sich der antiken Verse Goethes und seiner grossen Nachfahren, so muss man einräumen, durch Opitz wurde eine neue Bereicherung und Schmeidigung des deutschen Verses und der deutschen Form erreicht; für unsre Grossen, für ihre Sprache hat er eine neue Vorraussetzung geschaffen. Allmählich setzten sich auch die Gesetze und Rechte der deutschen Sprache in der neuen Form durch; aus Fremdem und Eigenem entstand wieder ein neues Deutsch (p. 67).

Ärzte, Lehrer, Professoren, Diplomaten, Beamte, Ratsherren, Bürgermeister, Reisende sind die Verfasser dieser Schriften. Wir preisen die gewiss viel grossartigere Phalanx von Dichtern und Schriftstellern, die im 18. Jahrhundert England aufbot. Aber wir brauchen den Vergleich mit England nicht zu scheuen. Die Deutschen sind Kleinbürger und Weltbürger zugleich, der Heimat und der ganzen Menschheit zugehörig, bescheiden, gediegen, sachlich, begeistert in ihrer Arbeit, zufrieden mit ihrer Wirkung auf einen kleinen Kreis. Weil von diesen Werken so viel so lange vergessen und unberührt blieb, haben sie sich vom ersten Glanz und der ersten Frische manches bewahrt, manche Wirkungsmöglichkeiten auf manche Geschlechter sind ihnen noch vorbehalten (p. 91).

No time is lost in fruitless theorizing. Valuations appear carefully weighted, moderate in praise and mindful of the author's epochal dependence and individual striving. Thus the book, in the hands of mature students, seems admirably adapted to replace

most of our old repetitoria, which so often are mere collections of names, titles, and dates. But the scholar will find it no less useful as the work of a master who looks over his field of knowledge from a high point of vantage.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

The Monks and the Giants, by John Hookham Frere, edited by R. D. WALLER. Publications of the University of Manchester. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926, pp. 139. \$3.00.

Frere's poem, of which *Beppo* was a professed imitation and without which we might not have had *Don Juan*, has been more talked about than read, perhaps because it has been relatively inaccessible. This reprint will therefore be welcome, the more so since it was made possible by the bequest of a distinguished scholar, Sir Adolphus William Ward, to the University of Manchester. Included in the volume are three pages—all that survive—of a continuation of the work which Frere never published, a number of valuable notes, brief bibliographies, and fifty-seven pages of a readable and useful account of "The Italian serio-comic romance" and of its imitations in nineteenth-century England. Mr. Waller has brought together considerable information that is of interest and is either new or not easily found. He has established, for example, the priority in composition, though not in publication, of *The Monks and the Giants* over W. S. Rose's *Court of Beasts*. Yet his work should be compared, for the fuller treatment of some points, with Eichler's study of Frere and C. M. Fuess' excellent *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse*. In particular he neglects Casti and attributes to Frere's influence several characteristics of *Don Juan* that may have been derived from the eighteenth-century Italian, one of whose volumes Byron had "got almost by heart" before Frere's poem appeared.

The Monks and the Giants is funny but not funny enough. Frequently for a few lines it is worthy of Byron but it is not sustained; it lacks his vividness and rapidity, his power, and the fascination of his personality. Then, too, it by no means runs the gamut of emotions as *Don Juan* so astonishingly does; it has none of the latter's sudden shifts from tenderness to humor, from sublimity to matter-of-fact realism, from idyllic beauty to satire.

Although the price in America is too high, it is to be hoped that the sales of the book, which should be in every College library and which every lover of amusing verse and every student of Byron will want to own, will encourage Mr. Waller to give us a reprint of Tennant's *Anster Fair*.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS.

BRIEF MENTION

The Poetical Works of John Gay. Edited by G. C. FABER (Oxford Edition of Standard Authors). New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. Pp. xlvii + 700. \$1.50. At last a scholarly edition of Gay,—a carefully collated text, full bibliographical details, all the verse plays and “operas,” one poem hitherto unprinted and several that have never been reprinted, as well as the doubtful pieces and a discussion of them (including reasons for thinking that those found in “Gay’s Chair” were forged by their first editor). Although it contains no biography and no criticism, few volumes offer so much for the money.

R. D. H.

Miss Elizabeth L. Chandler’s *Study of the Sources of the Tales and Romances written by Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853* [Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, VII, 4, 1926] gives the earliest possible, latest possible, and probable or certain dates of composition for the novels and tales written during this period in a table which is of reference value to students of American literature. The “sources” mentioned in the title are merely the note-book jottings which later found their way into Hawthorne’s published work.

LEON HOWARD.

The Three Wartons. A Choice of their Verse. Edited with a note and a select bibliography by ERIC PARTRIDGE. London: The Scholartis Press, 1927. 7 sh. 6 d. 192 pp. It is one of the pleasant ironies of justice that as we emerge from the dominance of romanticism, we rescue its pioneers from the neglect to which our romantic forebears had abandoned them. The rehabilitation of the Wartons, father and sons, may be regarded as complete with the publication of this beautiful book, though an aspiring doctor may yet make Joseph the subject of a dissertation and an edition of Thomas’ *Observations on the Faerie Queene* is wanted. The tastes of scholar and gentleman are admirably met by the pleasant introduction and the well-selected bibliography and poems. Only the specialist will want more of either and he need not seek far. If there be a fault, it is in the use of the somewhat dazzling italic type and the omission of a list of the poems included.

CLARISSA RINAKER.

A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare. Polesworth in Arden. By ARTHUR GRAY. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. 123 pp. A pleasant fiction has been devised by Mr. Gray, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, to rationalize the early life and training of William Shakespeare, and thus to meet the objections of the anti-Stratfordians that the "rude player from Stratford" was too ignorant to have written the plays. Mr. Gray believes that Shakespeare was taken as a page into the household of Sir Henry Goodere of Polesworth Hall, and there, along with Michael Drayton, educated in an environment of culture and refinement. No real evidence is presented in support of this interesting conjecture, set forth solemnly, even piously, by Mr. Gray. There is a quiet charm, however, about the naïve little book which leads one to hope that Mr. Gray may use his imagination in avowedly creative writing. Surely other Warwickshire sketches would find sympathetic readers.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

Briefe von C. F. Meyer, Betsy Meyer and J. Hardmeyer-Jenny, herausgegeben von O. SCHULTHESS. Bern, A. Francke. 1927 (Neujahrsblätter der Literarischen Gesellschaft Bern, N. F. Heft 5). Ein hübsches Neujahrs Geschenk von kundiger Hand, diese kurzen Briefwechsel Conrad Ferdinand Meyers und seiner Schwester mit Hardmeyer Jenny und eine Lebensskizze des letzteren, der uns besonders als 'alter Kracher' interessiert, wie er sich kellerisch-schweizerisch in einem der Briefe selbst bezeichnet. Für Meyers Schaffen aufschlussreich ist das Erlebnis, das zu der Gestaltung des Gedichtes 'Ewig jung ist nur die Sonne' führt, die Varianten des 'Pilgerims' und das beigefügte sehr schöne Faksimile der Handschrift dieses Gedichtes.

ERNST FEISE.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

MARCH, 1928

Number 3

A STUDY OF AMY LOWELL'S FAR EASTERN VERSE

. . . the West is the East, with the puritan night
Swallowed up in a gush of approaching daylight
At least, so our cherished delusion mistakes it,
And since everything is as man's attitude makes it,
What the Orient knew we are learning again.

Amy Lowell, *A Critical Fable*.

After the appearance of *East Wind* and *Ballads for Sale*, two posthumous volumes of poems by Amy Lowell, it now seems possible to attempt a special study of her treatment of Far Eastern themes from the point of view of a student of comparative literature. In this place, I propose to discuss the genesis of her interest in these motifs, to make a running commentary upon her Far Eastern poetry, to show how far her art was influenced by the Japanese and Chinese poets, and to indicate her merits as an interpreter of the Far East.

For the past fifteen years, an interest in the poetry of China and Japan has been characteristic of the "new poetry movement." At first thought it may appear strange that a group of poets who preferred to experiment with the forms of free verse should concern themselves with the rigidly syllabic poetry of the Japanese or the rimed stanzas of the Chinese. But as these modern poets were partly intent upon writing poetry in the syntax of prose, they naturally found special satisfaction in the newer prose translations from the Chinese and Japanese, while they remained almost uninfluenced by the artificial versification that strikes those who read this poetry in the original. For as a matter of fact, this new school of poets thought that Far Eastern poetry had a real kinship to "the picture making of the modern poet."

As in the case of most of the American poets who have heard the call of the Far East, as I have shown in a recent article,¹ many reasons of a personal character may be given to explain Amy Lowell's interest in the Far East. It will be remembered that her brother Percival Lowell was for some years resident in Korea and Japan,² that Japanese were frequent guests in the Lowell home, that Boston is a centre for the study of Far Eastern art, and that Mrs. Florence Ayscough, who later collaborated with Amy Lowell on *Four-Flower Tablets*, a series of translations from the Chinese, was a girlhood friend. Indeed, Amy Lowell's deeply-rooted appreciation of Japanese art is shown by two poems, "A Coloured Print by Shokei" and "A Japanese Wood-Carving," found in her first book, *A Dome of Many-Coloured Glass* (1912).

After this literary début (at the age of thirty-six), Amy Lowell went to London in 1913, where she fell in with a group of writers who were then cultivating an acquaintance with Chinese and Japanese poetry and art, under the influence of British scholars. This was the year of Tagore's first visit to the West. Amy Lowell met Ezra Pound in London and was influenced by him, I believe. Pound, the inventor of the name "Imagist," was also the literary executor of Ernest Fenollosa, who left unpublished several manuscripts concerning the Japanese Nō drama, and many notes on Chinese poetry. These essays and translations appealed strongly to Pound, and he perhaps communicated his enthusiasm for Far Eastern poetry to Amy Lowell. I know that when the London Imagists published their first booklet, *Des Imagistes* (April, 1914), Pound was represented therein by several paraphrases from the Chinese.

Yet Miss Lowell was slow in attempting to express herself in the manner of the Japanese poet or painter. In her next books, *Sword Blades and Poppy Seed* (1914) and *Men, Women and Ghosts* (1917), the only thing that is specifically Japanese is perhaps the perspective of some of the landscapes or some of the imagery. In her lectures called *Six French Poets* (1915), she

¹ See "L'Appel de l'Extrême-Orient dans la poésie des États-Unis," *Revue de littérature comparée*, Jan. 1928.

² He was the author of four books on the Far East. *Chōsen* (1885), *The Soul of the Far East* (1886), *Notō, an Unexplored Corner of Japan* (1891), and *Occult Japan* (1895).

did not enlarge upon Francis Jammes's curious interest in China, nor is there anything definitely Japanese in the anthologies entitled *Some Imagist Poets*, which she published for the re-organized Imagist school in 1915, 1916 and 1917, except the series of "Lacquer Prints" to be found in the last volume, which were reprinted in *Pictures of the Floating World*, 1919.

From 1916 to 1919, however, Miss Lowell grew more interested in Japan. Her acquaintance with the art and thought of that country was at first decidedly superficial, if it be judged by her special praise, in her *Tendencies in Modern American Poetry* (1917), of John Gould Fletcher's lines entitled "A Young Daimyo," of which she wrote (p. 339): "This to an occidental mind certainly has the charm of Japan."

When first he came out to meet me,
He had just been girt with the two swords;
And I found he was far more interested in the glitter of their hilts
And did not even compare my kiss to the cherry blossom.*

There is a greater fund of accurate information in Amy Lowell's poem on Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan, entitled "Guns as Keys; and the Great Gate Swings" (*Seven Arts* for August, 1917, now to be found in *Can Grande's Castle*, 1918). The parts of the poem that tell of the movements of Perry's squadron are written in "polyphonic prose," while the passages in cadence depict scenes in Japan at that date. In this poem, as it seems to me, Amy Lowell adopted the technique, not of the Japanese poet, but of the Japanese designer of color prints or painter of illustrated scrolls,—the *makimono*. In support of this assertion, let me adduce the evidence that several lyrics in this poem are manifestly verse reproductions of well known color prints. The often quoted lines:

At Mishima in the province of Kai,
Three men are trying to measure a pine-tree
By the length of their out-stretched arms

(*Can Grande's Castle*, p. 51)

* Young daimyo in feudal Japan were first girt with two swords at a much more tender age, nor was kissing practiced at that time. Fletcher's cherry blossom simile is incorrect and foreign to Japanese thought.

are an exact reproduction of one of Hokusai's "Thirty-Six Views of Fuji." ⁴

But the publication of her fifth volume of poetry, *Pictures of the Floating World* ⁵ (1919), showed Amy Lowell as now adopting "the *hokku* pattern" for certain of the poems called "Lacquer Prints." The volume also contains seven "Chinoiserie," "written in a quasi-Oriental idiom." Indeed, as the preface said, many of these poems also "owe their inception to the vivid colour-prints of the Japanese masters." ⁶ Here again, two poems are once more reminiscent of Edmond de Goncourt's prose. ⁷ But of the 59 compositions in the Japanese series, only seven are cast in the tripartite arrangement that is characteristic of the *hokku*. Perhaps this was the reason why the Japanese poet Jun Fujita, writing in the columns of *Poetry* (June, 1922, p. 164), was led to say that Amy Lowell "missed the essential quality of the Japanese in her *hokkus*." I also hear many false notes in this pseudo-Oriental

⁴ I was startled to discover that Miss Lowell's verses on the geisha dance of a Corean Ambassador (p. 66) contain some striking verbal reminiscences of Edmond de Goncourt's description of one of Utamaro's most elaborate works:

The beautiful dresses
Blue, Green, Mauve, Yellow;
And the beautiful green pointed hats
Like Chinese porcelains

(. . . ces femmes coiffées d'étranges chapeaux pointus verts, où le bleu, le vert, le mauve, le jaune rappellent la décoration des porcelaines chinoises. E. de Goncourt, *Utamaro*, def. ed., p. 17).

Amy Lowell had difficulty with foreign proper-names at times. Cf. in "Guns as Keys" p. 57, *Sanno* for *Sano*; p. 70, *Taketani Sabai* (?); and *Arimitsu* cloth (?); p. 88, plum-trees of *Kingawa* (query, *Kanagawa*?).

⁵ This title translates the Japanese word *ukiyo-e*, a popular name for the realistic colored prints.

⁶ Miss Lowell, in her introduction to the *Diaries of Court Ladies of Old Japan*, translated by Annie S. Omori and Kochi Doi (1920), confessed that "many of us live in daily communion with Japanese prints." This essay, by the way, is an excellent outline of Japanese history and literature, in which, as my Japanese friends tell me, Miss Lowell's insight enabled her to make some remarkable characterizations.

⁷ Compare the poem "Document" (p. 10), with E. de Goncourt's *Hokusai* (def. ed., p. 180), and the poems "At the Bookseller's" (p. 109) with Goncourt's *Utamaro* (def. ed., p. 144).

poetry, and I have found that when critics praise these "Lacquer Prints" they always select the same four or five pieces for our admiration.

Disregarding chronology for a moment, in order to complete the study of the Japanese themes in Amy Lowell's work, I call attention to the attempt that she made to adopt the strict *hokku* metre of 5, 7 and 5 syllables in a suite called "Twenty-Four Hokku on a Modern Theme" which appeared in *Poetry* for June, 1921, and was later included in *What's O'Clock* (1925). This volume also contains a later poem entitled "The Anniversary," which has all of its twenty-four stanzas in the *hokku* metre. To me, it seems that these poems reveal more Japanese influence than all the rest of Amy Lowell's work, since the adoption of a foreign form of verse surely marks a deeper, more vital influence than the mere poetical interpretation of an Eastern work of art or the re-telling of a legend. Miss Lowell's Far Eastern writings, up to this time, may be fairly called a "Free Fantasia on Japanese Themes," to borrow the title which she herself gave to one of her earlier poems. Now at last she made a supreme and final effort to forget herself and write original verse like a Japanese poet, and this with a fair measure of success.

Miss Lowell's life of John Keats and a plan to revise for publication the translations which Mrs. Ayscough proposed to make from Chinese poetry began to absorb the poet's attention about 1918. The first of Amy Lowell's versions, then called "Chinese Written Wall Pictures," appeared in *Poetry* for February, 1919, and were incorporated in the volume called *Fire-Flower Tablets*, published in December, 1921. As a part of her preparation for this work, she had read extensively about China,⁸ and she was perhaps thus led to compose "A Legend of Porcelain," published in the *North American Review* for March, 1920, and now to be found in *Legends* (1921). I am not fully competent to criticize this poem in its details, nor inclined to do so after reading Amy Lowell's preface, where she said: "That inaccuracies from the point of view of the student of folk-lore have crept into the poems, I have no doubt, nor does it make any difference to me."

⁸Preface to *Legends*, p. ix: "I will not enumerate other books on China which I have read. Indeed, I could not, they are so many."

Her collaboration with Mrs. Ayscough led Miss Lowell to the adoption of a special theory for the rendering of Chinese poetry which is stated in the Introduction to *Fir-Flower Tablets* and in Mrs. Ayscough's article "Amy Lowell and the Far East" in the *Bookman* for March, 1926. In a word, this was to express in English, whenever the rhythm allowed, the component parts of the pictographs found in the Chinese texts. This method of translation leads inevitably to some questionable interpretations,⁹ for which it seems that Amy Lowell was herself responsible. For instance, the Chinese character meaning "green" is also regularly applied to blue objects. But whenever a Chinese poet thought of the blue skies, Miss Lowell and Mrs. Ayscough make him speak of "green heavens." *T'ien shan*, a common Chinese phrase, refers to the celestial mountains, suggesting their purity, and not to any "heaven-high hills" with a suggestion of altitude. In practice, therefore, their theory of literal or pictural analysis of the Chinese character merely intensifies the latent queerness of these versions. Another criticism, made by a competent judge, is that there is "too much pomp and color" in Miss Lowell's renderings.¹⁰

One regrets especially that *Fir-Flower Tablets* do not give a better idea of Chinese poetical form. Miss Lowell stated in her preface that she had "as a rule, strictly adhered" to the lines of the original stanza, and yet she allowed herself much liberty in this respect "solely in the interest of cadence." Professor Pelliot and the Chinese critic Hsin-Hai Chang also point out that some of the poems were not placed by Mrs. Ayscough in the mouth of the proper speaker.¹¹ Thus, as Archibald Macleish so aptly put it, "Nowhere in the book does one come upon that spurious air of similitude which in portrait painting produces the impression, even upon those who do not know the original, that the picture

⁹ Cf. Witter Bynner, "On Translating Chinese Poetry," *Asia*, Dec. 1921; "to drag out from an ideograph its radical metaphor lands you in a limbo-language." Miss Lowell's theory is also latent in Fenollosa's essay on "The Chinese Written Character," which was published by Pound in the issues of the *Little Review* for 1918.

¹⁰ Witter Bynner, in the article quoted above.

¹¹ See Pelliot's review in *Young Pao*, 1922, pp. 232-244, and H. H. Chang, "The Vogue of Chinese Poetry," *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1922, pp. 99-114.

is an excellent likeness. These translations are poems, they are as much Miss Lowell's as they are Li T'ai Po's."¹²

Let me now take up the more general subjects of influence and esthetic doctrines. In my new book on *The Far East in Modern French Literature*,¹³ I have shown that, roughly speaking, the older interpreters of the Far East approached their subject through only one channel, by the help of books, through the Eastern arts, or by travel in the Orient. Amy Lowell's approach was not so simple. If she found the materials for her Chinese writings in books and manuscripts, her Japanese poems are usually suggested by Japanese art though it is easy to see that she made frequent use of the many books on Japan. I feel sure that Amy Lowell's familiarity with Japanese art greatly stimulated her tendency towards innovation in poetry and the acceptance of new esthetic standards. We know that she considered, with John Gould Fletcher, that the modern poets are more and more indebted to the Japanese for a realization of the value of psychological suggestion.¹⁴ Her general method of poetical composition became curiously like the technique of the Japanese painters of "pictures of the floating world," a school which is famous for skill in design and pattern-making. A list might easily be prepared of the motifs common to Amy Lowell and to this school of Japanese art, including, for instance, the willow tree, the peony, cats and fire-works. Curiously enough, three-fourths of these very motifs are entirely absent from classical Japanese poetry. On the other hand, as a New Englander, Amy Lowell could not forget to commemorate, in such poems as "Lilacs" and "Meetinghouse Hill," the China trade of her forefathers. But the Chinese influence was far weaker, for she was seldom moved to the composition of such fragments after the Chinese manner as "Wind and Silver."¹⁵ One cannot but

¹² Archibald Macleish, "Amy Lowell and the Art of Poetry," *No. Amer. Rev.*, March, 1925, p. 520.

¹³ W. L. Schwartz, *The Imaginative Interpretation of the Far East in Modern French Literature, 1800-1925*. Bibl. de la Rev. de Litt. comparée, Champion, Paris, 1927.

¹⁴ Cf. Amy Lowell, *Tendencies in Modern American Poetry*, p. 337, and Royall Snow, "Poetry in Borrowed Plumage," *New Republic*, Feb. 9, 1921, p. 312-5.

¹⁵ See *What's O'Clock*, pp. 68, 82 and 221.

regret therefore that Amy Lowell could not visit the Far East when we compare some of the renderings in *Fir-Flower Tablets* and the *hokku* in *What's O'Clock* with her earlier "Chinoiseries" and "Lacquer Prints."

In conclusion, it seems to me that Amy Lowell is less important as a mere interpreter of the Far East than as a propagandist, practitioner and theorizer who drew attention to the poetry and art of China and Japan, as she chose to do even in writing her life of John Keats (see Vol. II, pp. 41-2 and 248). "She had a genius for catching the public eye," she called herself in her *Fable*,

a modern White Knight

Forever explaining her latest inventions,

and if we ever graft Far Eastern branches upon the stock of English poetry, we will turn back to Amy Lowell's Oriental verse with the gratitude and respect due to an inspired explorer.

WILLIAM LEONARD SCHWARTZ.

Stanford University.

POE AND AMY LOWELL

Students of versification, and in particular of rime, may be interested to note that one of the special features of Miss Lowell's "polyphonic prose"—indeed, the only feature of any importance—was specifically anticipated by Poe. In the Preface of *Can Grande's Castle* Miss Lowell wrote a defense of rime at unexpected intervals, which is the principal characteristic of her "polyphonic prose."

Rhyme is employed to give richness of effect, to heighten the musical feelings of a passage, but it is employed in a different way from that usual in metrical verse. For, although the poet may, indeed must, employ rhyme, it is not done always, nor for the most part regularly [in "polyphonic prose"]. In other words, the rhymes should seldom come at the end of the cadences, unless such an effect be specially desired. This use of rhyme has been another difficulty to readers. Seeing rhymes, their minds have been compelled by their seeming strangeness to pull them, Jack-Horner-like, out of the text and unduly notice them, to the detriment of the passage in which they are imbedded. Hearing them read without stress, they pass unobserved, merely adding their quota of tonal colour to the whole.

Poe's lucid statement of the same view is to be found at the end of his history of the development of rime. In "The Rationale of Verse" (Virginia Edition of Poe, xiv, p. 229) we find these exact words:

It would require a high degree, indeed, both of cultivation and courage, on the part of any versifier, to enable him to place his rhymes—and let them remain—at unquestionably their best position, that of unusual and *unanticipated* intervals.

A careful study of the two passages in their respective contexts simply confirms the impression that the two poets were working towards identical theories of rime. For a fuller discussion of the matter by Poe, with his comment on the unexpected rime in line fourteen of "The Raven," see his article in *Graham's Magazine* for March, 1846 (Virginia Edition, xvi, p. 84).

EDWARD D. SNYDER.

Haverford College.

DOPPELDRUCKE VON WIELANDS *AUSERLESENEN* *GEDICHTEN*

Dass von der ersten Ausgabe der *Auserlesenen Gedichte*, Leipzig, 1784 (B⁶) mehr als ein Druck existierte, war bisher nicht geahnt worden. Bei Vergleichung mehrerer Exemplare erwies sich jedoch Bogen B eines Exemplares des ersten Bandes als Neudruck, und zwar schon durch die hier vorhandene Signatur: "Wielands auserl. Ged. I. Band." Die übrigen Bogen dieses Bandes tragen keine Signatur, sondern nur den Bogenweiser (A, C, D, usw.).¹ Lesarten: S. 17, 1 Durch seufzer EB^{5a} Mit seufzen B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 17, 6 welcher dich besessen EB^{5a} der dich plagte B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 17, 8 Das übel wuchs. Ich wollte dich nicht plagen, und änderte die cur EB^{5a} Ich änderte die cur B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 21, 1 die Schöne Welt B^{5a} die Schöne-Welt B^{5b}.

¹Um die Entdeckung weiterer Doppeldrucke zu erleichtern bemerke ich dass der 2. Bd. anfangs (Bogen A-M) "Wielands griech. Erzähl" signiert ist, später (Bogen N-X) "Wielands auserl. Ged.," ohne Bandzahl. Auch im 3. und 4. Bde. steht genau dieselbe Signatur, auch hier fehlt die Bandzahl. Nur in den Bänden 5-7 ist auch die betreffende Bandzahl angegeben. Daraus lässt sich folgern, dass der neugedruckte Bogen B des 1. Bandes nicht älter ist als Bd. 5 des Originaldrucks (1785).

21, 21 daß jenes B^{5a} Das jenes B^{5b} Drf. 23, 12 aus weissem thon EB^{5a} aus thon B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 24, 3 thür? B^{5a} thür, B^{5b}B⁶. 26, 8 Phrynen B^{5a} Phrynen B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 18 läge; EB^{5a} läge, B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 19 ihm träumt' EB^{5a} und träumt' B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 26, 22 erträncke EB^{5a} berausche B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 29, 2 einem Blick EB^{5a} einem—Blick B^{5b}B⁶C¹. 31, 5 Herr. Ich B^{5a} Herr; ich EB^{5b}C¹. 32, 1 wer weis EB^{5a} wer weiß B^{5b}C¹. An etwa 60 Stellen ersetzt B^{5b} die in B^{5a} vorkommende Majuskel durch die üblichere Minuskel; an 5 Stellen wird die Schreibweise *denck-* des Druckes B^{5a} in B^{5b} durch *denk-* ersetzt (20, 20; 21, 13; 22, 6; 24, 17; 29, 8).

Schon die Lesarten auf S. 17 beweisen dass B^{5b} keinen mechanischen Nachdruck von B^{5a}, sondern einen revidierten Text darstellt: dieser stimmt zwar in der Hauptsache mit B⁶ überein, stellt jedoch andererseits ein früheres Stadium der Revision dar. Man beachte z. B.: S. 17, 22 denckt B^{5ab} denkt B⁶. 18, 12 zancken B^{5ab} zanken B⁶. 21, 6 sehnt B^{5ab} sehnt, B⁶. 22, 12 denckt B^{5ab} denkt B⁶. 24, 14 sie; B^{5ab} sie: B⁶. 26, 7 trancken B^{5ab} tranken B⁶. 29, 17 flamm' B^{5ab} flamm B⁶.

AUSERLESENE GEDICHTE, Leipzig, 1789-1792.

Nur von den Bänden 1-6 dieser zweiten Ausgabe der *Auserlesenen Gedichte* (B⁶) liegen mir Doppeldrucke vor, der 7. Bd. ist in allen Exemplaren von ein- und demselben Satze. Der Nachschuss wurde also vor 1794, dem Erscheinungsjahr des 7. Bandes, gemacht,—von dem einmaligen Satze desselben konnte dann die nötig gewordene höhere Auflage sofort abgezogen werden. Der echte Druck B^{6a} kennzeichnet sich als solchen durch genauere Übereinstimmung mit der Vorlage B⁵: bei dem ersten Bande wurde der Doppeldruck B^{5b} benutzt, wie schon die oben mitgeteilten Lesarten dartun. Die Ausgabe letzter Hand scheint von B^{6a} abzustammen, obschon auch gelegentliche Übereinstimmungen zwischen B^{6b} und C¹ nachzuweisen sind.

ERSTER BAND: S. 1, 9 stellung B⁵B^{6a} Stellung B^{6b}. 4, 2 seiuem B^{6a} Drf. 9, 20 jagte, B^{6a} Drf. jagte. B⁵B^{6b}. 11, 13 spalt B⁵B^{6a} spalt; B^{6b}. 15, 8 belehrt; B⁵B^{6a} belehrt: B^{6b}. 21, 21 Das B^{5b}B^{6a} Drf. Daß B^{6b}; von faulem B⁵B^{6a} vom faulem B^{6b} Drf. 25, 15 gut, B⁵B^{6a} gut. B^{6b}. 27, 13 hatt' B^{6a} hätt' B^{6b}. 37, 21 schämen. B^{6a} schämen, B^{6b} Drf. 38, 13 gerungen B⁵B^{6a} gesungen B^{6b}. 48, 1

musikalischen B^{6a} musikalischen B⁵B^{6b}C¹. 51, 10 überirrd'sch B^{6a} Drf. überirrd'schen B⁵B^{6b}C¹. 60, 13 mir hundert B⁵B^{6a} mit hundert B^{6b} Drf. 61, 4 weisheit B^{6a} Weisheit B⁵B^{6b}. 62, 20 rosenfarbem B⁵B^{6a} rosenfarbnem B^{6b}C¹. 73, 17 nichts hat B^{6a} Drf. nichts bat B⁵B^{6b}C¹. Anstatt 151 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 15.

ZWEYTER BAND: Titel, Zeile 8 in VIII. Büchern B⁵B^{6a} in VIII Buchern B^{6b}. Z. 9 nochmahls B^{6a} nochmals B^{6b}. Z. 10 WEIDMANNISCHEN B^{6a} Weidmannischen B^{6b}. S. 2, 6 scherzt B⁵B^{6a} scherzt' B^{6b}. 3, 11 schon B^{6a} Drf. 4, 2 blicken B^{6a} bliken B⁵B^{6b}. 5, 16 scherz B⁵B^{6a} Scherz B^{6b}. 7, 5 schlafe B^{6b} Drf. 8, 18 kinder B⁵B^{6a} Kinder B^{6b}. 9, 15 Gotr B^{6a} Drf. 11, 4 meinem B^{6a} Drf. meinen B⁵B^{6b}. 11, 6 kan! B⁵ kann! B^{6a} kann B^{6b}. 11, 12 rücke B^{6a} Drf. rücken B^{6b}. 13, 16 schlummert B^{6b} Drf. 14, 12 einzuschließen; B⁵B^{6a} einzuschließen! B^{6b}. 16, 1 vorüberziehn B^{6a} vorüber ziehn B^{6b}. 16, 10 silberwagen B⁵B^{6a} Silberwagen B^{6b}. 16, 22 zurück B⁵B^{6a} zurück B^{6b}. 19, 14 dran B⁵B^{6a} dann B^{6b}. 22, 1 loszusagen B^{6a} los zu sagen B^{6b}. 22, 22 zn brauchen B^{6b} Drf. 24, 20 küssen: B⁵B^{6a} küssen. B^{6b}. 27, 4 er ruht' B^{6a} Drf. es ruht' B⁵B^{6b}. 28, 2 aller erstenmal B⁵ aller erstenmahl B^{6a} allererstenmal B^{6b}. 33, 14 liedgen vor: B⁵B^{6a} liedchen vor; B^{6b}. 38, 17 Ans B^{6a} Drf. Aus B^{6b}. 39, 18 geht B^{6a} Drf. gehn B^{6b}. 40, 8 verschlossen. B^{6a} Drf. verschlossen, B^{6b}. 40, 18 vollkomner B⁵ vollkommer B^{6a} vollkommner B^{6b}. 42, 13 anzuklagen, B^{6a} anzuklagen. B^{6b}. Anstatt 203 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 320; anstatt 8, 39 hat B^{6b} 3, 59. Die zum 2. Bde von B^{6b} benutzte Schrift ist etwas grösser als die der übrigen Bände.

DRITTER BAND: Titel, Z. 11 Weidmannschen B^{6a} Weidmannischen B^{6b}. Bl. [ii]^a, 13 composizion B^{6a} composition B^{6b}. 7, 8 räuschen B^{6a} Drf. täuschen B^{6b}. 9, 5 den heiden B^{6a} den beiden B^{6b}. 12, 3 gestalten B^{6a} Drf. 17, 6 wirt herzhählen B^{6a} wirth erzählen B^{6b}. 41, 19 bedekt B⁵B^{6a} bedeckt B^{6b}. 45, 9 das B⁵B^{6a} daß B^{6b}. 51, 17 zufinden B⁵B^{6a} zu finden B^{6b}. 55, 2 wallten B⁵B^{6a} walten B^{6b} Drf. 62, 11 Ritter; B⁵B^{6a} Ritter: B^{6b}. 66, 4 nnr B^{6a} Drf. 69, 1 ungefehr B^{6a} ungefähr B^{6b}. 69, 10 fest B^{6a} fast B^{6b} Drf. 74, 16 los zugehn. B⁵B^{6a} loszugehn, B^{6b}. 74, 20 regunglos B⁵B^{6a} regungslos B^{6b}. 77, 9 wurd' er B⁵ ward' er B^{6a} ward er B^{6b}. 80, 14 zulieb B^{6a} Drf. zu lieb B^{6b}. 86, 8 blik B⁵B^{6a} blick B^{6b}. 88, 2 in hof B⁵B^{6a} im hof B^{6b}. 92, 17 blat B⁵B^{6a} blatt

B^{6b}. 112, 2 Men B^{6a} *Drf.* Man B^{6b}. 112, 18 strauß B⁵B^{6a} straus B^{6b}. 272 Jena, gedruckt bey Johann Michael Maucke B^{6a} *fehlt* B^{6b}.

VIERTER BAND: Titel, Z. 12 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannischen* B^{6b}. S. 3, 11 sanftgekrümmter B^{6a} sanft gekrummter B^{6b}. 6, 9 Varer B^{6a} *Drf.* Vater B^{6b}. 10, 1 friede B⁵B^{6a}C¹ frieden B^{6b}. 13, 2 fastzerstörtem B⁵B^{6a} fast zerstörtem B^{6b}. 13, 6 einzge B⁵B^{6a} einz'ge B^{6b}. 14, 1 gepflanszt B^{6b} *Drf.* 16, 14 wie in B⁵B^{6a} wie ein B^{6b}. 17, 10 erlabt B⁵B^{6a} er labt B^{6b}. 19, 5 dafür B^{6a} darauf B^{6b} *Drf.* 22, 8 sie B^{6a} sich B^{6b} *Drf.* 25, 14 sêle B⁵B^{6a} seele B^{6b}. 26, 14 ungefahr B^{6a} ohngefahr B^{6b}. 27, 7 fuhlten B^{6a} fühlen B^{6b}. 31, 11 mindern B⁵B^{6a}C¹ lindern B^{6b}. 31, 18 flattert B^{6a} flattern B^{6b}. 32, 1 im sturmwind B^{6a}C¹ in sturmwind B^{6b}. 32, 4 Zulezt . . . ihr B^{6a} Zulezt . . . hier B^{6b}. 36, 1 hütten B^{6a}C¹ hütte B^{6b}. 36, 17 schlichen B^{6a} schliechen B^{6b}. 39, 2 blieb B^{6a} bleibt B^{6b}. 39, 5 rosigten B^{6a}C¹ rosigen B^{6b}. 40, 7 dem ihren B^{6a} den ihren B^{6b}. 190, 4 dem schilde B^{6a} den schilden B^{6b}. 191, 14 kniee B^{6a} 183, 2 im umlauf B^{6a} in umlauf B^{6b}. 188, 1 knaben B^{6a} knappen B^{6b}. 190, 4 dem schilde B^{6a} den schilden B^{6b}. 191, 14 kniee B^{6a} knie B^{6b}. 194, 6 gethan,, B^{6a} (*zwei Kommata*). 194, 11 seiner B^{6a} dieser B^{6b}. 197, 7 arbeitvollen B^{6a} arbeitsvollen B^{6b}. 197, 21 einer lanze B^{6a} eine lanze B^{6b}. 198, 9 Iungfraun B^{6a} Iungfrau B^{6b}. 198, 19 aus B^{6a} auf B^{6b} *Drf.* Anstatt 87 hat B^{6b} die Seitenzahl 86.

FÜNFTER BAND: Titel, Z. 8 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannischen* B^{6b}. 3, 2 Kaligel B^{6a} Kaligei B^{6b} *Drf.* 3, 7 welt B^{6a} weit B^{6b} *Drf.* 10, 7 nnd B^{6a} *Drf.* 12, 12 Einen B^{6a} einen B^{6b}. 12, 13 gieng es B^{6a} gieng er B^{6b} *Drf.* 14, 3 zwyten B^{6a} *Drf.* zweyten B^{6b}. 17, 5 dünnen B^{6a} *Drf.* dunnem B^{6b}. 18, 15 elektrischer B^{6a} elektrischer B^{6b}. 21, 11 Majestütsverbrechen B^{6b} *Drf.* 22, 3 wirst! die B^{6a} *Drf.* wirst die B^{6b}. 24, 13 bewohnbar B^{6a}C¹ bewohnt B^{6b} *Drf.* 27, 14 hekämet B^{6a} *Drf.* 29, 1 mirs rauben will B^{6a} mir rauben will B^{6b} *Drf.* 29, 20 diesem worten B^{6b} *Drf.* 30, 9 Dem besten B^{6a}C¹ Dem ersten B^{6b}. 33, 16 äusserllch B^{6a} *Drf.* 35, 3 sonderlichs B^{6a} sonderlich B^{6b}. 35, 9; 36, 1 blatt B^{6a} blat B^{6b}. 46, 3 durchgewacht B^{6a}C¹ durchgemacht B^{6b}. 54, 1 zappeln? B^{6a} zappeln! B^{6b}. 55, 14 mag! B^{6a} mag; B^{6b}. 60, 6 rauffen? B^{6a} rauffen! B^{6b}. 79, 13 schawrzem B^{6a} *Drf.* 79, 17 leidet B^{6a} leitet B^{6b} *Drf.* 102, 6 Einem B^{6a} einem B^{6b}. 104, 19

büſte B^{6a} büste B^{6b}. 105, 6 Uzim-Oſchantey B^{6a} Uzim-Gſchantey B^{6b} *Drf.* 109, 14 eſelkopf B^{6a} eſelskopf B^{6b}C¹.

SECHSTER BAND: Titel, Z. 8 *Weidmannschen* B^{6a} *Weidmannischen* B^{6b}. An den Leser S. [iii-vi]: *kursiv* B^{6a} in *Antiqua* B^{6b}. [vi], 3 geſchäftigten B^{6a} *Drf.* geſchäftigen B⁵B^{6b}. [vi], 15 fodern B^{6a} fordern B^{6b}. 3, 12 Aenéen B⁵ Aenen B^{6a} Aeneen B^{6b}. 5, 2 Zefeyrn B^{6a} *Drf.* Zefyrn B^{6b}. 5, 10 in mährchen B⁵B^{6a}C¹ im mährchen B^{6b}. 10, 1 ans B^{6a} *Drf.* aus B^{6b}; Titons B^{6a} Titans B^{6b} *Drf.* 10, 17 ſammetweichem B^{6a} ſammetweichen B^{6b}. 11, 19 alta B^{6a} *Drf.* alte B^{6b} 14, 18 ihrem B^{6a} ihren B^{6b} *Drf.* 18, 13 folge B⁵B^{6a}C¹ folgte B^{6b}. 19, 12 hofnung B⁵B^{6a} hoffnung B^{6b}. 25, 12 heiſst B^{6a} *Drf.* heiſst B^{6b}. 31, 2 durchzutrotten B^{6a} durchzurotten B^{6b} *Drf.* 35, 5 ſtille B^{6a} ſtillen B^{6b}C¹. 39, 2 mir ſogar der B⁵B^{6a}C¹ mir der B^{6b}. 40, 4 mach B^{6a} *Drf.* macht. B^{6b}. 40, 13 die namenloſe B⁵B^{6a} die namenloſen B^{6b}C¹. 46, 15 nich B^{6a} *Drf.* 47, 1 daſe B^{6a} *Drf.* daſſ B^{6b}. 53, 5 kofſtatt B^{6a} *Drf.* hofſtatt B^{6b}. 54, 14 haubthâr B⁵ haubthaar B^{6a} haupthaar B^{6b}. 55, 6 ſtâl B^{6a} ſtahl B⁵B^{6b}. 63, 16 gedreükt B^{6a} *Drf.* 69, 15 jeder tropfe B⁵B^{6a} jeder tropfen B^{6b}C¹. 77, 15 ſolltet B^{6a} ſollet B^{6b} *Drf.* 254, 18 Zbniden B^{6a} *Drf.* 259, 7 ſckmilzt B^{6a} *Drf.* 262, 1 einem B^{6a} einen B^{6b} *Drf.* 267, 10 der jugend B^{6a}C¹ der tugend B^{6b}. 280, 1 welche B^{6a} welchen B^{6b} *Drf.* Anſtatt 130 hat B^{6a} die Seitenzahl 103.

W. KURRELMEYER.

THE SPANISH SOURCES OF CERTAIN SIXTEENTH CENTURY FRENCH WRITERS

In a little book published in 1912, by Monsieur Pierre Villey, *Les Sources d'idées au seizième siècle*, the distinguished French scholar was the first to emphasize the fact that if the influence of Spain upon French literature became important in the seventeenth century, it had already begun to be felt in the sixteenth through the activity of French translators. Mr. Villey, however, limited himself to general statements and did not attempt to estimate the number of French translations which issued from French presses during that period; nor did he try to define their influence upon French thought, except, perhaps, in the case of Montaigne.

A study of Foulché-Delbosc's *Bibliographie Hispano-Française* and Brunet's *Manuel du Libraire* indicated that at least 625 editions of French translations from Spanish works appeared in France during the sixteenth century. Of these, 352 were romances of chivalry or sentimental novels; 94 dealt with theological questions; 169 may be called, for the sake of convenience, books on moral philosophy; and 30 were accounts of voyages or descriptions of newly-found lands. It is with these last two divisions of French editions, nearly two hundred in number, that we are concerned here.

A preliminary survey showed that the influence of this significantly large number of translations was exercised, primarily, upon a group of French writers commonly known as *essayistes*, in contrast to the *conteurs*, or story tellers. No definite distinction, however, can be made between these two classes of writers. We find considerable philosophical or encyclopaedic material in the text of the *conteurs*, and many a story in that of the *essayistes*. We may say, in general, that the productions of the latter consisted of heterogeneous compilations of maxims, anecdotes, fables, legends, historical reminiscences, geographical descriptions, scientific curiosities, and didactic or satirical digressions, sometimes contained within the frame-work of a dialogue, sometimes worked into the form of lessons, or short chapters, but very often presented to the reader in fanciful or disordered array after the medieval fashion of Giraldus Cambrensis or Caesar of Heisterbach.

This literary *genre*, which seems to have been a development of such works as the *Moralia* of Plutarch, the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, and the *De Factis Dictisque Memorabilibus Libri IX* of Valerius Maximus, found expression, in the sixteenth century, in the *Adagia* of Erasmus, the *Lectioinum antiquarum Libri XVI* of Coelius Rhodiginus, in the *Officina* of Ravisius Textor, and in the *De honesta disciplina* of Crinitus.

In France, the most representative essayists of the period were :

- Pierre Bouaystuan, *Théâtre du Monde*, 1558. *Histoires prodigieuses*, 1560.
 Jean de Marcouville, *Receuil d'aucuns cas merveilleux*, 1563.
 Jacques Tahureau, *Dialogues*, 1565.
 Pierre Breslay, *Anthologie*, 1574.
 Jean des Caures, *Oeuvres morales et diversifiées*, 1575.
 Montaigne, *Les Essais*, 1580, 1588.

Nicolas de Cholières, *Les Matinées*, 1585. *Les Après Disnées*, 1587.
Guillaume Bouchet, *Les Serées*, 1584, 1597, 1598.

All these writers are more or less indebted to Spanish sources. In the case of Montaigne there is little that can be added to the researches of Messrs. Pierre Villey, Louis Clément, and Gilbert Chinard. These critics have shown, for instance, that the great French essayist borrowed the idea of grouping his material under central headings from Pedro Mexía, the author of the *Silva de Varia Lección*; that the bulk of his essays on *Les Cannibales* and on *Les Coches* was taken from Gomara's *Historia de las Indias*; and that at the head of a group of Spanish moralists, read by him, stood bishop Antonio Guevara, the author of *Marcus Aurelius*, and the *Golden Epistles*.

Between the *Essays* of Montaigne and the diversified productions of the other French essayists there is evidently a vast difference. It is useless to expect from the latter the exquisite style and the penetrating power of observation of one who has been called the father of analytical psychology. They must be given credit, however, for having contributed to the popularization of knowledge at a time when the thirst for new things was apparently unquenchable. They helped to enlarge society's point of view, which was imbued with the spirit of the Renaissance, by reproducing and repeating one after another, facts and ideas from Plutarch, Herodotus, Pliny, and Aristotle, as well as from contemporary scientists, explorers, and historians. Some had the merit of preceding and perhaps paving the way for Montaigne, others emulated him; they are therefore entitled to a share of his glory.

Our investigations have shown that the joint influence of Guevara and Mexía is especially strong in Pierre Bouaystuan's *Théâtre du Monde*. In this pessimistic little book, which is a long-drawn lamentation on the wretchedness and insignificance of man, there is little original material. What Bouaystuan does not reproduce from the Scriptures or St. Augustine's *City of God*, from Pliny or from the Italian scientist Cardanus, he takes from Guevara's works and from Mexía's *Diverses Leçons*. In so doing he shows little regard for literary ethics and frequently appears to be quoting ancient authors while, as a matter of fact, he reproduces textually the two Spanish writers. Two instances of this will suffice:

Bouaystuan.¹

Marc Varron, l'un des plus dignes auteurs qu'onques escrivit en Latin, dit qu'en Espagne il y eut un gros bourg situé en pais sablonneux, qui fut tellement fouy & cavé par les connils finalement les habitants l'abandonnerent.

Mexia.²

Marc Varron dit qu'en Espagne y eut un gros bourg, situé en pays sablonneux, qui fut tellement foui et cavé par les connils que finalement il fut ruiné.

Bouaystuan.

L'Empereur Auguste disoit que depuis que les hommes avoient vecu cinquante ans ils devoient mourir ou desirer qu'on les tuat pource que jusque là étoit le comble de la felicité humaine.

Guevara.³

L'Empereur Auguste Octavien disoit que depuis que les hommes vivoient cinquante ans, ou de leur volontier devoient mourir ou par force se devoient faire tuer pource que tous ceux qui ont eu quelque felicité humaine jusque là sont au terme, comble et fin d'icelle.

In a few instance the *Théâtre du Monde* contains marginal references to its sources, but these may have been inserted by the printer after the composition of the work. In most cases there are no indications of the author reproduced or imitated. An exception to this statement must be noted, however, in Bouaystuan's treatment of life at court. This is a nearly textual, two page reproduction from Antonio Guevara's *Menosprecio de Corte*, with due reference to its source.⁴ The total indebtedness of Bouaystuan

¹ From: *Le Théâtre du Monde. Contenant le discours des misères humaines. Plus, L'Excellence & dignité de l'homme. Composé par P. Bouaystuan. A Lyon, par Nicolas Perrineau. M. D. LXV.*

² From: *Les Diverses leçons de Pierre Messie. Gentil-homme de Seville. Mises de Castillan en François, par Claude Gruget, Parisien. A Rouen, de l'Imprimerie de Jean Roger. M. D. XXVI.*

³ From: *L'Horloge des Princes, avec le trèsrenommé Livre de Marc Aurèle, Recueilly par don Antoine de Guevara. Traduit de Castillan par feu Herberay des Essars. A Paris. Chez Michel Sonnius. 1588. (First edition issued in 1555.)*

⁴ The first French edition of this work appeared in 1542 from the press of Estienne Dolet, at Lyon. It enjoyed 19 editions before the end of the century. It is fundamentally a picture of the trials and disappointments of court life as contrasted with the advantages of rural life. It appeared when Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* was at the height of its popularity and the two books were generally considered as representing the two opposite sides of a much debated question.

to Spanish authors, as far as the *Théâtre du Monde* is concerned, amounts to at least twenty-five passages, varying in length from short paragraphs to several pages.

Among the French essayists of the sixteenth century who are still relegated to the category of obscure writers, there is a certain Seigneur de Cholières, who produced, in the second half of the century, a series of four books,⁵ made up of rambling dissertations and dialogues on the most varied subjects, in a style colored at times with the good-humored facetiousness of Rabelais, at others with the cynical licentiousness of Béroalde de Verville. The few commentators who have done Cholières the honor of criticizing his works have not been altogether favorable to him, and yet they have recognized that he was a man of erudition and that he wrote good vernacular French. The value of Cholières' works may possibly lie in his views on the feminine question. His chapters: *On women, On marriage, On the age of husbands*, reveals some originality and considerable familiarity with the philosophy of married life.

Cholières is indebted to Spanish sources for the greater part of his *Matinées*' first chapter, *De l'or et du fer*, into which he launches into a violent invective against the Spanish *conquistadores*, their thirst for gold and their cruelties against the natives. In so doing he follows closely Lopez de Gomara's *Historia de las Indias*,⁶ in the first part of which an account is given of the explorations of Bastides and of Juan de la Cosa, of the Caribs and their attacks upon the Spaniards, and of the inevitable reprisals.

Cholières would seem to indicate that he was familiar with Bartolomé de las Casas' *Brevissima Relación*⁷ as he comments upon the sufferings caused to both Indians and Spaniards by the latter's mad search for gold. In the same chapter he reproduces from

⁵ *Les Neuf Matinées*, 1585; *Les Après-Disnées*, 1587; *La Guerre des masles contre les femelles*, 1588; and *La Forêt nuptiale*, 1600.

⁶ The first French edition is as follows: *Histoire des Indes occidentales et terres neuves, qui, jusqu'à présent ont été découvertes. Traduit en français par Martin Fumée*. Paris, 1569.

⁷ This work, which was translated in the chief languages of Europe and which precipitated a violent controversy on the question of slavery, was published at Sevilla, in 1552. It was translated into French by Jacques Migrodes and first appeared in its French garb in 1579.

Mexía's *Diverses Leçons* a long array of facts related to rings and their uses in different regions. In his *Après-Disnées* Cholières dedicates a chapter to beards, and in the discussion of this odd subject he adorns his text with a rather fanciful elaboration of facts mentioned by Gomara in his descriptions of early Mexican races. In another chapter, *Des Prognostics et Prédictiones Astrologiques*, he refers to the expedient resorted to by Columbus on the Island of Jamaica, when, driven by hunger, he threatened to darken the surface of the moon unless the natives provided him with food. This constitutes another close reproduction from a chapter of Gomara's *Historia*, which contains an account of Columbus' fourth voyage. In both his books Cholières inserts, here and there, episodes and data borrowed from Mexía and Guevara.

Jean Bouchet, the son of a well known printer of Poitiers, was judge and consul for the merchants of his native town. Like Nicolas de Troye and Noël du Faÿl he enthusiastically dedicated to writing the spare hours left from his official duties. He became associated with a little group of men who constituted a sort of small provincial Pléiade. His name was closely linked with those of Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, Jean de la Péruse, and de Baif. Bouchet, without attaining any high degree of literary excellence, had an intimate knowledge of his contemporaries, and although not especially gifted with imagination, he possessed a vast and remarkable erudition. His *Serées* consist of three books, made up of conversations and dialogues, on the usual diversified subjects, held at the table, each evening, by certain townspeople of Poitiers. There are 36 of these *soirées* and each, after the model set by Mexía, deals with some special subject such as wine, water, women and girls, physicians and medicine, thieves, cripples or hunchbacks, and cases of individuals that had been beheaded, hanged, or banished.

As a result of these investigations we were able to identify reproductions from Spanish authors in at least twenty of Bouchet's *Serées*, in addition to many scattered references to Spanish works. Aside from the abundant material he appropriates from Guevara, Mexía, and Gomara, Bouchet takes from López de Castañeda, who had written, in 1554, a history of the conquest of India by the Portuguese; from Antonio de Torquemada, the author of that fantastic *Jardín de Flores Curiosas*, known in France as the *Hex-*

améron; from Oviedo's *Historia General de las Indias*; and from Juan Vives' *Commentaries on St. Augustine's City of God*. In his chapter on *Wealth* and *Avarice* Bouchet indicates that he has read bishop de las Casas' description of Spanish greed. He also had read that landmark of Spanish literature, the *Celestina*, and Mr. Gustave Reynier has shown how Bouchet inserted in his fifth *Serée* a long and textual reproduction from the ninth act of this Spanish tragedy.⁸

A more interesting contribution to the *Serées*, however, was that of Juan de Dios Huarte, an eminent physician who had published, in 1575, a psychological study so remarkable for its daring speculations that it was placed upon the Index, but not before it had been translated into Italian, French and Spanish, and reedited many times in these languages. In French it was known as the *Anacrise*, or *Examen des Esprits*, and its author was not generally known.⁹

Although Bouchet does not always mention his sources the name of the *Anacrise* appears at least thirty times throughout his work. Reproductions from Huarte are especially numerous and lengthy in the 34th *Serée*, entitled: *Les Fols, Plaisans, Idiots & Badins*. Bouchet seems to have been impressed by Huarte's analysis of judgment, of intellect and memory, by his ideas on the methods of acquiring a new language, and by his speculations on the causes of insanity.

G. L. MICHAUD.

University of Michigan.

SOURCES OF TWO SONNETS OF BARTOLOMÉ LEONARDO DE ARGENSOLA

The fact that Bartolomé Leonardo borrowed from the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch is especially interesting in that it shows the inaccuracy of certain general statements that have long been accepted. In his *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España*,¹ Menéndez y Pelayo

⁸ *Les Origines du Roman Réaliste*, 1912, p. 309.

⁹ *Anacrise, ou Parfait jugement et examen des Esprits propres & nais aux sciences. Composé en Espagnol par M. Jean Huart. Docteur, mis en françois, au grand profit de la République, par Gabriel Chappuys Tourageau. A Lyon, par Francois Didier, à l'enseigne du Fénix 1580.*

¹ Vol. II, second ed., Madrid, 1896, p. 388.

said of the younger of the Argensolas: "Su arte predilecto es el arte latino: no el italiano. Aborrece de muerte la sutileza y el metafisiqueo de los petrarquistas . . . Enójale todo uso frívolo y baladí de la poesía: no la concibe más que como matrona celtíbera, armada de hierro y con la ley moral en los labios"; and very nearly the same words were applied by the Count de la Viñaza to both brothers.² These statements will certainly require modification when a complete study of the sources of the two poets has been made.

Petrarch, indulging his fondness for subtleties, wrote his sonnet XIX:

Mille fiate, o dolce mia guerrera,
 Per aver co' begli occhi vostri pace,
 V'aggio proferto il cor; m'a voi non piace
 Mirar sì basso colla mente altera:
 E se di lui fors' altra donna spera,
 Vive in speranza debile e fallace;
 Mio, perché sdegno ciò ch'a voi dispiace,
 Esser non può già mai così com'era.
 Or s'io lo scaccio, ed e' non trova in voi,
 Ne l'esilio infelice, alcun soccorso,
 Né sa star sol, né gire ov'altri il chiama,
 Poria smarrire il suo natural corso:
 Che grave colpa fia d'ambeduo noi,
 E tanto più de voi, quanto più v'ama.³

Argensola's imitation is limited to the quatrains:

No es mío mi corazón, pues os le he dado,
 Ni vuestro, pues que no lo habéis querido;
 A mí no ha de volver, que aborrecido
 Le tengo, pues de vos es desamado.
 Pues dalle a otra mujer, tan excusado
 Será, como de vos ser recibido;
 Ni en mí ni en vos, ni en otro recogido
 A donde alberga el corazón cuitado.
 Amor que ni por fuerza ni por ruego
 Puede alcanzar del vuestro que le quiera,
 Que desprecia de altivo sus despojos,
 Porque siervo tan fiel no se le muera,

² *Algunas obras satíricas de Lupercio y Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola*, Saragossa, 1887, p. 8.

³ *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca*, ed. G. Mestica, Firenze Barbèra, 1896, p. 23.

Le cría y le sustenta con el fuego
Que hurta de la lumbre de esos ojos.⁴

Equally subtle is Petrarch's sonnet CIX:

Amor, che nel penser mio vive e regna,
E'l suo seggio maggior nel mio cor tène,
Talor armato ne la fronte véne:
Ivi si loca, ed ivi pon sua insegna.
Quella ch'amare e sofferir ne 'nsegna,
E vól che 'l gran desio, l'accesa spene
Ragion, vergogna e reverenza affrene,
Di nostro adir fra sé stessa si sdegna.
Onde Amor paventoso fugge al core,
Lasciando ogni sua impresa, e piange e trema:
Ivi s'asconde, e non appar piú fóre.
Che poss' io far, temendo il mio signore,
Se non star seco infin a l'ora estrema?
Ché bel fin fa chi ben amando more.⁵

Here the adaptation is more close, the poet departing from his model only in the last tercet:

Amor, que en mi profundo pensamiento
Sus nobles fuerzas aprestadas tiene,
Tal vez armado hasta los ojos viene,
De donde a los de Cintia lo presento.
Mas ella opuesta al raro atrevimiento,
Para que en lo futuro se refrene,
Aquella risa, aquel favor detiene,
Con que suele aliviar el sufrimiento.
Huye a su centro el dulce dueño mío
Temeroso y cortés; que no hay sugeto
Que contra sus desdenes muestre brío:
Yo deste rayo, no por el efeto
Que en los mortales haze, me desvío;
Mas porque sirve a celestial preceto.⁶

OTIS H. GREEN.

University of Pennsylvania.

⁴ *Obras sueltas de Lupercio y Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, coleccionadas e ilustradas por el Conde de la Viñaza*, Madrid, 1889, vol. II, p. 43.

⁵ *Le Rime*, ed. cit., p. 213.

⁶ *Rimas de Lupercio i del Doctor Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola*, Saragossa, 1634, p. 193.

OLD NORSE NOTES

7. *Some Observations on Mímir.*

In Norse mythology Mímir (or Mímr) is an enigmatic figure. The material bearing upon him is mostly contained in the Eddic poem "Völuspá" and even this little is cryptic and seemingly inconsistent. In stanzas 28 and 29¹ we are informed of a fountain of Mímir in which Odin's eye is concealed, and that Mímir drinks every morning from the pledge of Odin. In stanza 46, at the approach of *ragnarök*, there is mention of the playing of the sons of Mímr and of Odin speaking to (consulting?) the head of Mímr. The speaking of the head of Mímr is mentioned in a fragment included in the Eddic poem "Sigdrífumál (stanza 14), where it is evidently also associated with Odin. If stanza 13 of this poem belongs with 14, as one must assume to be the case, and if its *Heiðdraupnir* is identical with Mímr, as it has been understood,² this stanza refers Odin's (*Hróptr*) knowledge of the runes to inspiration from the liquid dripping from the skull of Mímr. The kenning *Míms vinr* (friend of Mímr) for Odin occurs three times in skaldic poetry.³ Comment of the *Snorra Edda* upon the references in "Völuspá" is not without interest. The "Gylfaginning"⁴ locates the fountain of Mímir beneath one of the three roots of Yggdrasils ash, that one toward the *hrímpursar* (frost giants), and explains that it contains wisdom, which its owner Mímir secures by drinking from it with the Gjallarhorn. Odin had to pawn his eye for a drink from this fountain. Again in the account of the approach of *ragnarök*⁵ it is told that Odin rides to the fountain of Mímir and takes counsel of Mímir for himself and the other gods. These notes rightly or wrongly serve to clarify one's ideas as to the content particularly of *Völ.* 29. At first glance there may seem to be a more substantial addition in the

¹ Sijmon's edition.

² Cf. Gering's translation: *Die Edda*, 214 (1892); also the translation of Heusler-Genzmer: *Edda*, II, 168 f. (1920).

³ Cf. Jónsson, 2nd edition of Egilsson, *Lexicon poeticum*, under Mímir; Meissner, *Die Kenningar der Skalden*, 252.

⁴ *Snorra Edda*, ed. Jónsson, 20 f.

⁵ P. 63.

rather remarkable account of Mímir contained in the introductory part of the "Ynglinga saga" at the beginning of Snorri's *Heimskringla*.⁶ On the occasion of the establishing of peace after war between the two groups (of gods), Æsir and Vanir, hostages were exchanged, the Æsir sending Hœnir, with Mímir accompanying him. As it became evident to the Vanir that Hœnir depended entirely upon Mímir for advice, they felt themselves duped, cut off the head of Mímir and sent it to the Æsir. Odin embalmed the head with herbs to prevent its decay, and uttered incantations over it so that it retained the power of speech and could furnish him otherwise unattainable information and advice. The whole account of the gods at the beginning of the "Ynglinga saga" is notoriously euhemeristic and one may readily suspect that the embalming of the head is a rational explanation of how Odin could have possessed a head (not his own) from which he secured advice, rather than a part of any ancient myth.⁷ The account of the circumstances under which Mímir was deprived of his head may on the other hand well be old, at any rate the inclusion of Mímir among the gods, or more specifically among the Æsir, is decidedly important and entirely in accord with the little said about him in older sources. One can hardly escape the assumption that Mímir (or Mímr) was originally a god, not for example a giant or a water-spirit, unless we insist on referring the gods themselves back to phenomena of nature. Both later comment and older Eddic and skaldic sources are entirely consistent in indicating a close relationship between Odin and Mímir and apparently also in making Odin secure knowledge in general or particular advice from Mímir. The advice is however not secured directly from the living Mímir, but (and here lies an inconsistency in the commentary as apparently also the original) through two sources: the head of Mímir and his fountain or spring. One can hardly refrain from seeking some connection or an actual identity between the two so different conceptions. It must have been a feeling of the

⁶ Ed. Jónsson, I, 12 f., 18.

⁷ A. Bugge at the close of an otherwise interesting article (*Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, IX, 371, 1925) suggests Celtic influence, in that while the primitive Germans were not in the habit of saving heads the Gauls used to preserve the heads of their chieftains in oil, but this obviously has no application to the story of Mímir.

necessity of such connection that led Mogk⁸ to say that a spring is the "head" of a river. Now the "head of a stream" is a familiar enough expression in English and common elsewhere and Mogk's explanation is of course not a new one.⁹ I doubt if in the expression anything more than a physical comparison is involved. The source of a stream is naturally its highest point, its "head." That its other extremity is called its mouth instead of its foot is merely a different comparison in which the other no longer presents itself to the mind. One does not call a body of water as such a head, and still less a head a body of water. In fact Schröder¹⁰ expressly denies that the place-names in which "head" and its cognates occur designating the source of a stream have any validity in proof of the suggestion of Uhland.

A much more likely connection, it seems to me, is to be found in the old Germanic use of the human skull as a drinking-vessel, attested for example by Paulus Diaconus¹¹ and for Old Norse illustrated in the making of drinking-cups out of the skulls of the two sons of Athl¹² and the two sons of Níðuðr.¹³ Such a drinking-vessel fashioned from the skull of Mímir could readily have been designated in poetry both the head of Mímir and his fountain, from which Odin drank. That the wisdom of the living head should be retained in a beverage drunk from the skull is a not unnatural conception. So far as streams or small bodies of water may have taken their names from Mímir,¹⁴ the name-giving may with as much or as little probability be referred back to wide-

⁸ Hoops, *Reallexikon der germ. Altertumskunde*, III, 225 (1915). Mogk also subscribes to the idea that Mímir was a water-spirit and infers a contamination of a religious rite of consulting a dead man's head.

⁹ Cf. Ludwig Uhland, *Schriften*, VI, 206 (originally published 1836); Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, V, 102 (1883); Golther, *Religion und Mythos der Germanen*, 73 (1909); and more recently E. Schröder in *Namn och Bygd*, XII, 110 ff. (1924) and XIV, 20 ff. (1926).

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, XII, 118.

¹¹ *Historia Langobardorum*, I, 27; II, 28.

¹² "Atlamál" 77.

¹³ "Völundarkviða" 25. The use of the human skull as a drinking-vessel is treated with great thoroughness by Andree in *Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde*, XXII, 1 ff., 1912.

¹⁴ Uhland, *op. cit.*, 202 f.

spread knowledge of the myth of the drinking from his skull as to his having been originally a water-spirit. It is indeed a question whether certain other Old Norse mythological matter may not have originated under the influence of this myth, particularly the somewhat farcically employed conception of Odin securing his poetic inspiration from a draught of the mead of Suttungr.¹⁵ Whether the conception of the fountain of Urðr (the fate representing the past) may have also developed out of that of the fountain of Mímir or the relation is a different one I shall not discuss here. The two have at least become intertwined to some extent.

What seems to me peculiar confirmation of the above interpretation of the head and fountain of Mímir is found in a late saga, the so-called *Þorsteins saga bæjarmagns*. This is one of the fairly short fornaldarsaga-like tales¹⁶ attached to the Norwegian king, Óláfr Tryggvason, and contains, as many of them do, interesting mythological or legendary material, in a late and much distorted form. Among the Odyssean adventures of the hero is an encounter with Goðmundr á Glæsisvöllum (Guðmundr á Glasisvöllum), a person of gigantic stature, son of the king of Risaland, to which country he is now heir after the death of his father. The kingdom is tributary to the giant Geirrauðr (Geirrøðr), king of Jötunheimar. Now Geirrøðr is well known from older Norse sources as an original giant, with whom Thor was on hostile terms. Guðmundr, judging from the frequent mention of him, must also have played a part in early myths or legends, though his original story is not preserved. I have elsewhere¹⁷ for reasons quite independent of the *Þorsteins saga bæjarmagns* conjectured that Odin himself must somewhere have appeared under this name. That he here meets us as a giant is the natural fate of a heathen god in a Christian time and environment, which has not gone so far as to make him a devil. Even here, in contrast to the original

¹⁵ "Hávamál" 103-109; "Hav." 140, which is probably not in its proper place and at any rate refers to this same episode, speaks of a son of Bölþorn (uncle of Odin?) who taught Odin nine incantations and so enabled him to get the mead. This uncle of Odin has been taken to be Mímir (Rydberg, *Undersökningar i germansk mytologi*, I, 468 f., 1886; Gering, *Die Edda*, 106, 1892; Heusler-Genzmer, *Edda*, II, 171, 1920).

¹⁶ Published in *Fornmanna Sögur*, III, 175 ff., 1827.

¹⁷ *Modern Philology*, XXV, 154, 1927.

giant, Geirrþór, he is kindly and well-disposed toward the hero, but naturally antagonistic toward Geirrþór, whose destruction he coöperates with the hero to bring about, and to whose kingdom he accordingly succeeds.¹⁸ Among the valued possessions of King Geirrþór was a remarkable large drinking-horn which bore the name of Grímr hinn góði. At its tip it was adorned with a human head with flesh and mouth (or according to another reading flesh and hair); it had the power of speech and could prophesy the future, especially the coming of war. Things of value had to be given it by all who drank from it. Over a hundred years ago this horn Grímr was explained¹⁹ as borrowed from the myth about the head of Mímir, and the corruption or change of name to Grímr was apparently correctly accounted for through the apelative *gríma* (=mask²⁰). While the horn is not represented in the *Þorsteins saga* as originally belonging to Guðmundr, it naturally becomes his property, like the other possessions of Geirrþór, after the latter's death. Its byname *hinn góði* is also of importance in judging its origin. In the *Hrólfs saga Gautrekssonar*²¹ there is a horn also characterized as *it góða*, named Hringhorni, with a ring upon the tip and with power of prophetic warning, though not the power of human speech. The "*Helga þáttur Þórissonar*"²² also knows the name Grímr belonging to each of two horns sent by Guðmundr af Glæsisvöllum to King Óláfr Tryggvason, brought by two messengers who were likewise named Grímr. This is repeated in the first chapter of the "*Nornagests þáttur*."²³ Even Saxo²⁴ knows of a remarkable horn among other valuable posses-

¹⁸ The Eddic poem "*Grímnismál*" presents a conflict between Odin under the *alias* of Grímnir, and Geirrþór. Though the prose framework and introductory stanzas seem to conceive of Geirrþór as a king and not a giant, it is a question whether he is not originally the same Geirrþór and this story of the encounter between Odin (Grímnir) and Geirrþór does not stand in some relation to the story of Guðmundr and Geirrþór.

¹⁹ By Peter Erasmus Müller in *Sagabibliothek*, III, 246 f., 1820.

²⁰ Grímr is also a name of Odin; Müller also saw the close connection of the story otherwise with the account of Guthmundus and Geruthus given by Saxo Grammaticus, ed. Holder, 287 ff.

²¹ Detter, *Zwei Fornaldarsögur*, 46 f., 65 f.

²² *Flat.*, I, 359 ff.; *Fms.*, III, 135 ff.

²³ Wilken, *Die prosaische Edda*, ed. 2, I, 237.

²⁴ Ed. Holder, 290 f.

sions of Geruthus (Gerrrøðr), but as in the "Helga þáttr" without any clear connection with Mímir. However both these sources seem to point to the same obscured identity of Guðmundr with Odin. The twelve splendid maidens of the "Helga þáttr," who appear to the hero riding from the woods, clad in red and with horses to match, whose seductive leader Ingibjörg declares herself to be the daughter of Guðmundr af Glæsisvöllum, may well be Odin's valkyries, and it is a remarkable correspondence that Saxo also has twelve seductive daughters of Guthmundus (along with twelve sons).

That Mímir appears in the *Þiðreks saga* and other German sources as the name of a skilled smith is merely a natural lowering (or raising, if one prefer) of his chief characteristic of wisdom to manual skill. Kaarle Krohn²⁵ has reversed the relation, suggesting that the name Mímir was taken from the German heroic legend, where he appeared as a smith. Krohn's reference to a Christian legend concerning Adam's skull seems also to be entirely without value in this connection.²⁶ If the name has been correctly interpreted as related to the Latin *memor*, etc., the element of wisdom is already present in its etymology.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

STURM UND DRANG ONCE MORE

In preparing my little study on *Early References to Storm and Stress in German Literature*, published in the *Indiana University Studies* (No. 71) about a year ago, it did not occur to me that this modest contribution would attract much attention. Now it has been honored by two notices in this one journal, the note of Professor Kurrelmeyer in XLII, 3 (March), 1927, pp. 176-177, and the eight-page disquisition of Professor Walz in XLII, 8 (December), 1927, pp. 531-538. My chief purpose was to supplement the account in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* with a view to assisting the German scholars in charge of the forthcoming *Heft* which

²⁵ *Skandinavisk mytologi*, 112, 1922.

²⁶ Vergil's and other speaking and prophesying heads are referred to in Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* (4th ed., by E. H. Meyer), III, 109, 1878.

will contain the word "Sturm." In having elicited two such important *Vorarbeiten* as these two notices constitute, I feel that my effort, which merely presented and interpreted such material as I had happened to find with limited library resources at my disposal, has not been in vain.

By drawing attention to his own and other studies in the *Zeitschrift für Wortforschung*, Professor Walz has brought to light material of whose existence I was unaware. I note with satisfaction that it tends to corroborate some of my general findings. The points upon which the conclusions of Professor Walz seem to differ from mine I should like to touch briefly, again with a view to the forthcoming article in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*.

My reference in the Preface to the "generally prevalent" (and erroneous) belief that *Sturm und Drang* as applied to the movement owes its inception to Tieck, was aimed not so much at the books, though of course it can be found in some, as it was at opinion which I have heard expressed in numerous academic lectures and conversations both here and abroad. I meant to correct it. The passage by Hildebrand in the *Wörterbuch* I can not help interpreting to mean that he actually felt that Goethe, Horn and Menzel were unfamiliar with the term as a *terminus technicus* because they did not use it. Hildebrand overlooks passages in Horn's book of 1812 (p. 182—also an allusion on p. 169)¹ and Menzel's of 1828, and quotes not a single occurrence before Tieck. His eighteenth-century citations merely serve to show the genesis of the term, and that incompletely. I still have the feeling that Hildebrand's article, with its serious gap, which could easily have been filled by Schlegel, Horn, Bouterwek, etc., creates in a sense the impression of inconsistency. The manner in which he states that he has found no occurrences before 1828, gives me the impression that he has searched in vain and doubts their existence, at least to any large extent. Then he proceeds, on Tieck's authority alone, to call the term "völlig gangbar" in 1828. It strikes me as inconsistent in Hildebrand to proceed part-way on his own

¹ See also Horn's *Umriss zur Geschichte und Kritik der schönen Literatur Deutschlands während der Jahre 1790 bis 1818*, Berlin, 1819, p. 35: "die Sturm- und Drang- und Empfindsamkeitsperiode," and "Man hatte eingesehen, dass es mit dem Stürmen und Drängen doch nicht viel auf sich . . . habe."

authority and then, that failing as the result of oversights, to rely solely upon Tieck for a statement not in harmony with his personal findings.

My statement that the term does not become "fixed and standard" before Scherer seems to have been misleading. It was based not upon any frequency tabulation. And indeed Scherer does not use the term more frequently than some of his predecessors, though I have the conviction that he is rather more conscious of its position of primacy as compared with the other terms, than Gervinus, Koberstein and Vilmar are. The idea I meant to convey was not that Scherer first gave the term currency, for I called attention to its use by his predecessors. My thought was that the present primacy of the expression in current usage, though beset by the welcome attempt of Köster and others to create a distinction between it and *Periode der Originalgenies*, is due in great part to Scherer and above all to the widespread influence of his book upon scholarship. By virtue of his tremendous influence, I would say, Scherer fixed and standardized the phrase for the generations succeeding him, just as he fixed and standardized for many years his whole method of approach.

Professor Walz cautions us that we must distinguish carefully between the literary *terminus technicus* and the looser use of the term as referring to emotional literature. I fear, however, that in dealing with early occurrences, as that which Professor Kurrelmeyer quotes from the *A B C Buch für grosse Kinder*, and those which I found in H. L. Wagner, Nicolai, Knigge and Iffland, it is not always safe to label them too precisely loose or technical. Evidently the term was then in the process of growing into its technical connotation. Rather than simply call such uses general and loose, I should prefer to regard them as midway stations on the way toward crystallization. To me it does not seem a far cry from Iffland's "Sturm- und Drangstücke" (1793) to Schlegel's "Sturm- und Drangperiode" (1800, 1803). Is the latter necessarily more technical than the former? Does the former necessarily refer more to emotionalism than the latter? It seems to me that such an assertion would go too far.

Finally I call attention to another early eighteenth-century use of *Sturm und Drang*. It is found in a letter of Heinse to Fritz

Jacobi, dated Rome, March 16, 1782²—of no later date, it would seem, than Professor Kurrelmeyer's passage. Heinse writes that Klinger is visiting him ("Jetzt nun hab ich Klingern hier"). Klinger has urged him to come to St. Petersburg and has promised him the position of librarian to the Grand Duke. Heinse is loath to accept and after recounting various reasons, continues: "und endlich sind noch andre Umstände dabey, die den ganzen Plan für mich zu einem vergeblichen Sturm und Drang machen." This use is interesting not only because of its early date but also because it reveals Heinse under the influence of Klinger, with his predilection for the term, which I believe the latter adopted in 1776 without much urging on Kaufmann's part, having previously revealed a penchant for the two words as such.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

University of Cincinnati.

THE MAN OF TASTE

In December, 1731, Pope published his "Epistle on Taste" to the Earl of Burlington. Like many others of Pope's satires, this one gave rise to other literary pieces which played with its subject and title. There was a satirical comedy, *Mister Taste the Poetical Fop, or the Modes of the Court, A Comedy, By the author of the opera of Vanelia or the Amours of the Great* (1732), published by E. Rayner and reissued the next year by "L. Gulliver," with the title *The Man of Taste*, but keeping the running title *The Poetical Fop; or the Modes of the Court*. There is also a poem called *The Man of Taste* (1733) by the Reverend James Bramston (1694?-1744) vicar of Harting and Lurgashall, Sussex. And finally there is a comedy by the Reverend James Miller (1706-1744), *The Man of Taste; or the Guardians* (1735).

The first of this series was anonymous. It was directed against Pope, who figures in it as "Mr. Alexander Taste," the ridiculous and deformed lover of Lady Airy (of course Lady Mary Wortley Montagu). On the title page appear the lines:

² *Wilhelm Heineses sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. v. Carl Schüddekopf, vol. 10, Leipzig, 1910, p. 154.

No more, O Pope, what Chandois builds, deride
Because he takes not Nature for his guide,
Since, wondrous critic! in thy form we see
That Nature may mistake as well as he.

It was, according to its title page, "acted by a summer company near Twickenham" and was by the author of *Vanelia; or the Amours of the Great* (1732), which was "acted by a private company near St. James." This latter piece was one of a number which made scandalous literary capital over the amour of the Prince of Wales and the Honorable Anne Vane. The printed catalogue of the British Museum lists (in addition to *Vanelia*), *Vanella, The Fair Concubine: or the Secret History of the Beautiful Vanella* (1732); *Vanella in the Straw* (1732); and *Vanella, a Tragedy* (1736). Genest lists still another in which the lady is called Vanessa (x, 157). Apparently the author of this *Man of Taste* and of *Vanelia* was by trade a literary scandal monger, catering to a snobbish interest in the seamy side of high life. This appears in such subtitles as *Modes of the Court* and *Amours of the Great*, clearly intended to catch the vulgar. Doubtless too, "the summer company near Twickenham" and "the private company near St. James" were merely silyly transparent allusions to actors in the comedies in real life, Pope and Lady Mary, and the Prince and Miss Vane. The first publisher, Rayner, if one may judge from occasional references to him in the public prints, was a man of dubious professional standing, and the second, "L. Gulliver," is a creature of the imagination. Lawton Gilliver, Pope's publisher, and book-seller to *The Grub-street Journal*, was often referred to jokingly as "Captain Gulliver," and this may have been an attempt to impose on the public and make it think him responsible for *The Man of Taste*. But obviously he was publishing no scurrilous satires on "Mr. Alexander Taste." Rayner was probably still the proprietor, since the "Gulliver" issue carries an advertisement of "Books lately published by E. Rayner."

The Reverend James Bramston's *Man of Taste*, is typically pro-Pope and anti-Dunce. It is an ironical poem on taste in all fields; in the section on literature it derides Blackmore, Bentley, Cibber, Curll, and Tindal; and praises Thomson, Swift, Milton, and Pope. It was reprinted in Dodsley's *Poems by Several Hands* (I, 286).

The third *Man of Taste*, by James Miller, is one of the usual

early eighteenth century comedies of wit, manners, and intrigue, and has no connection with Pope's Epistle. It has been distinguished from the earlier play in *Biographia Dramatica* and also in the catalogue of the British Museum, where the earlier title has appended to it the note, "A different work from J. Miller's comedy with the same title." A writer in *Notes and Queries* (Series II; XII, 293), however, ascribes to Miller not only the scandalous comedy of 1732, but also, and logically enough, *Vanelia*, since both were the products of one pen. Miller's biographer in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, accepting this ascription, also makes Miller the author of both plays, although he avoids giving him two distinct plays of the same name by listing the first with its original title, *Mister Taste, the Poetical Fop*. For some reason or other, Bramston and his poem seem to have kept clear of the tangle.

The ascription of the first comedy to Miller is of course absurd. His being a clergyman was, in the 1730's to be sure, no bar to his writing such pieces as this and *Vanelia*. Moreover, he had little luck in his profession, and had had to become a literary and dramatic hack to get a living. From this side alone, one might be unsuspecting of his authorship. But on the other hand he was a friend and admirer of Pope; was treated kindly by *The Grubstreet Journal*, which was for some time Pope's personal organ; and, it is almost certain, later became its editor. Surely he would not be one to hold up to public derision the moral and physical failings of "Mr. Alexander Taste," any more than Lawton Gilliver would have been one to publish such stuff.

J. T. HILLHOUSE.

University of Minnesota.

A NOTE ON CHAUCER'S YEOMAN

Line 104 of the *Prologue*, in speaking of the Yeoman, describes him bearing under his belt "a sheef of pecok-arwes, brighte and kene." Skeat, in his volume of *Notes to the Canterbury Tales*,¹ gives a number of parallel references to the peacock-feathered shafts.

I should like to call attention to two additional references, which to my knowledge have not been pointed out before. The first

¹ Works of Chaucer (1894), II.

occurs in a will dated London, April 20th, A. D. 1361, wherein John de Bonyndon or Bovyndon (?), apothecary, bequeathes "to John Pountz his kinsman, Richard Pountz, and Thomas, brother of Richard . . . sums of money and bows and arrows furnished with feathers of Pecok."²

The second passage is a part of the tale of "Owen et Lunet ou La Dame de la Fontaine" in J. Loth's standard translation of *Les Mabinogion*.³ It reads as follows: "Je me dirigeai vers la château; alors se présentèrent à ma vue deux jeunes gens aux cheveux blonds frisés . . . ils avaient à la main un arc d'ivoire; les cordes en étaient de nerfs de cerf; leurs flèches dont les hampes étaient d'os de cétaçes avaient des barbes de plumes de paon; la tête des hampes était en or . . ."

EDITH SMITH KRAPPE.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

A NOTE ON PARLEMENT OF THE THREE AGES 38

My lyame than full lightly lete I doun falle,
And to the bole of a birche my berselett I cowchide

The Parlement of the Thre Ages, 38-39.

Sir Israel Gollancz in his edition of *Parlement* (1915), an edition rich in its erudition and fine in its scholarship, glosses *lyame* (38) as "leash," i. e. the cord by which the hunter held his "limer," or scent-hound. In so doing, he is, I think, in error. If *lyame* be rendered by "leash," lines 38-39 would be read as follows: "My lyam (leash) then full lightly (quickly?) I let fall down, and to the bole of a birch I caused my bercelet to couch down," i. e. the leash was allowed to fall gently, because the slightest noise might have disturbed the stags close at hand. *Lyame* occurs again in line 61, where it is also glossed as "leash."

The process which the author describes is that of stalking the red deer with the aid of a bercelet,¹ or shooting-dog, for a shot

² *Calendar of Wills. Court of Husting*, ed. R. R. Sharpe (London, 1889-90), II, 39-40, roll 89 (147).

³ Loth, *Les Mabinogion du Livre Rouge de Hergest avec les variantes du Livre Blanc de Rhydderch* (Paris, 1913), II, 5-6.

⁴ Cf. *NED.* (s. v. *bercelet*, obs.), and *The Master of Game*, ed. W. A.

with the crossbow. The hunter's purpose is, of course, to obtain a view of the animal. The procedure which the hunter of our poem follows is, in the initial stages before the shot be fired, identical with that followed by the groom sent out with the lyam-hound, who goes to view the stag in his covert at early morn, in order that he may make his report to the hunting assemblage.

The directions how this should be done are given in the fifteenth century *Master of Game*, an English translation (with additions and subtractions here and there) of the *Livre de Chasse* (begun 1387) of Gaston Phébus, Count of Foix, made by Edward, second Duke of York:

And then shall the groom quest in the country that shall be devised to him the night before, and he shall rise in the dawning, and then he must go to the meating (pasturing) of the deer to look if he may see anything to his liking, *and leave his lymer in a certain place where he may not alarm them.*² And thence he should go to the newly hewn wood of the forest or other places where he hopes best to see a hart, and keep always from coming into the wind of the hart, he should also climb upon a tree so that the hart shall wind nothing of him, and that he can see him further. . . . Then he should fetch his lymer and cast round . . . and take care that neither he nor his hounds make but little noise for dread lest he void.³

The important information which the quotation above gives is that the hound is *secured*, and not free.⁴

If the procedure of the hunter be as described above, Gollancz's glossing of *lyame* by "leash" can hardly stand. The hunter would not allow his leash to fall lightly to the ground, even though he did cause his dog to lie down at the foot of a birch tree. It is, of course, within the realm of possibility that the dog might have been so well-trained that he would never have risen, even though the deer which our poet describes had fled past him. But that happy result of canine education is very dubious. It is much more

and F. Baillie-Grohman, London, 1909, pp. 122, 204-205, for discussion of this term.

² The italics are my own.

³ *Master of Game*, pp. 152-153.

⁴ For further evidence that the lyam-hound was secured in some way, see Tuberville's *Booke of Hunting* (Tudor and Stuart Library, Oxford, 1908), pp. 79-80.

probable that the dog was tied up, and that probability is strengthened by lines 60-61:

And I hyede to my hounde and hent hym vp sone,
And lousset my lyame and lete hym vmbycastle.⁵

* Had the dog been untied, the hunter would not have had to "hie" back; a call or whistle would have brought the animal up.

Lyame in line 38 is to be glossed not as "leash," but as "lyam-hound." The present form is defined by *NED.* (s. v. *lyam*, obs., 2) as a shortened form of *lyam-hound*. The use of this shortened form is attested by the following phrase from the Book of St. Albans (quoted in *NED.* s. v. *lyam*, obs., 2, as of date 1486): "A Sute of a lyam," and by its occurrence in the famous catalogue of dogs given by Edgar in *King Lear*.⁶ So glossed, the difficulties raised by taking the word to mean "leash" disappear, and lines 38-39 would be rendered as follows, *lete* being used in its causative sense (see *NED.* s. v. *let*, v¹, 13), and line 39 serving to amplify and extend line 38: "My lyam-hound then full lightly I caused to 'charge,' and to (against) the bole of a birch I caused my bercelet to couch."

HENRY L. SAVAGE.

Princeton University.

WAS BALZAC'S *ILLUSIONS PERDUES* INFLUENCED BY STENDHAL?

Balzac's *Illusions perdues* and Stendhal's *Le Rouge et le Noir* have as heroes young men who decide to make their way in the world by their wits only; consequently they make love to married women who are their social superiors; exposure by rivals merely results to their advantage; when they reach Paris, they measure at once the difference between its ideals and the ideals of their province, and resolve to master Parisian society; their good looks

⁵ While it is probable that *lyame* in these lines refers to the dog, "leash" is a possible translation. The meaning of lines 60-61 may be that the poet after untying the hound, loosened his leash (either by lengthening it to give the dog more play, or by removing it entirely from his collar).

⁶ *King Lear* (New Variorum Ed.), III, vi, 66-71.

and their tailors lend them important assistance in their effort, and for a while they are successful; then disaster comes, self-imposed in the one case, incidental in the other. Here is considerable likeness, both of tone and trend. But is that likeness sufficient to suggest that Stendhal's novel might have influenced Balzac's?

Balzac began *Illusions perdues* in the summer of 1836. He first mentions it in a letter to Mme Hanska, dated July 13. It was published early in 1837, and continuations appeared in 1839 and 1843. But while his letters often allude to it during this period of seven years, they do not speak of his purpose in writing it until December 21, 1842, when he tells Mme Hanska:

J'aurai peint, je crois, le triple mouvement qui amène de la province à Paris les poètes, les nobles et les bourgeois. *Le Cabinet des Antiques*, *le Député d'Arcis*, et *Illusions perdues*, qui formeront deux volumes de *la Comédie humaine*, à eux seuls, représenteront bien notre époque.

The letter of July 13, 1836, had said: "en huit jours j'avais inventé et composé *les Illusions perdues*, et j'en avais écrit le tiers." During these days Mme de Berny was dying. Did Balzac's grief, recalling to him the days when he was tutor to her son and won her love, bring to his mind Julien Sorel's beginnings in Stendhal's story?

In his pages on the Besançon cathedral, Stendhal had written of its chapter: "On espérait beaucoup de la vieille présidente de Rubempré," a piece of pure persiflage, which Balzac could appreciate. For Alberthe de Rubempré was still well known. And did this malicious fling fix Balzac's attention on that name, so suited through its sonority to express the brilliant, showy personality he had conceived? And could "Lucien" have been suggested by Stendhal's "Julien"?

Le Rouge et le Noir contains a picture of friendship. Fouqué's devotion to Julien Sorel, though unavailing in its endeavor to dissuade him from the career he had marked out for himself, was unwavering. Balzac's description of Séchard's constant, self-denying affection for Lucien, and of his counsels, equally disregarded, is carried to much greater length. Yet could the latter have grown out of the former?

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

A NOTE ON BAUDELAIRE

Poe more than once hid the name of an Egeria within the mazes of a poem (*A Valentine, Enigma*). Did Baudelaire, who in so many things was obsessed by Poe's example, attempt this? If so, probabilities lead us to consider first the sonnet *Je te donne ces vers* (significantly left without a title), the final poem of the series celebrating his mistress Jeanne Duval:

JE te Donne ces vers afin que si mon Nom
 Aborde heureusement aUx epoques lointaiNEs,
 Et fait rêVer un soir les cervelles humaines,
 Vaisseau favorisé pAR un grand aquilon,
 Ta mémoire, pareiLle aux fables incertaines,
 Fatigue le lecteur ainsi qu'un tympanon,
 Et par un fraternel et mystique chaînon
 Reste comme pendue à mes rimes hautaines. . . .

Poe used a strict mathematical scheme which resulted in very bad verse. If Baudelaire put the name Jeanne Duval here, the quality of the poem shows that he must have chosen a far simpler method. Baudelaire's character, at once subtle and *mystificateur*, would not have left the result patent: his schema, in case he had one, would be irregular as well as simple.

Now the name Duval runs down the sonnet through the third word of each line (Donne . . . aUx . . . rêVer . . . pAR . . . pareiLle). The letters of JEANNE occur in every third word (if we shorten the first interval) either beginning the word or in its final syllable (Je . . . donnE . . . Afin . . . moN . . . heureusemeNt . . . lointaiNEs). They also occur divided between the beginning and the end of the first two lines (JE . . . Aborde . . . Nom . . . lointaiNEs).

I submit the above as a conjecture that is at least interesting. If Baudelaire did not do *literally* what he implies he did in the second quatrain, there is now no need of explaining the result mystically or of leaving it as a coincidence. Have we not the Influence of the Subconscious? I turn humbly to the psychologists!

LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS.

The Johns Hopkins University.

COLERIDGE MARGINALIA

In Dr. Williams' Library, Gordon Square, London, there are a few books which formerly belonged to the library of H. C. Robinson. Four of these contain marginalia by S. T. Coleridge: *Museum* von Jean Paul, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1814; *Geist* — Jean Paul, Weimar und Leipzig, 1801; *Naturphilosophie* von F. W. J. Schelling, Jena und Leipzig, 1799; *Anthropologie* von Henrich Steffens, Breslau, 1822.

The marginalia are few and of very little interest, it seems. But I extract one from the fly-leaf of Steffens's *Anthropologie*, Erster Band, with the paragraph from pp. 14-15 to which Coleridge gives a reference.

Steffens: "Aber jenes Gefühl, welches uns in die Fülle der Natur versenkt, jenes heilige, reine Frühlingsgefühl, welches das quellende Leben der Natur, als das eigene, uns gibt, und alle Reichthümer, als unsere, ist das Fundament der Anthropologie. Wer dieses Gefühl, das reinste, das herrlichste das tiefste des Menschen, welches ihn nie ganz verlässt, welches eine wunderbare Freudigkeit über sein ganzes Daseyn verbreitet, festzuhalten vermag, der entdeckt unmittelbar, dass hier die Quelle seiner wahren Freiheit, der Punkt ist, wo jene Scheinfreiheit, die er durch den trennenden Verstand, durch die selbstsüchtigen Begierden im Gegensatz gegen die Natur thöricht behaupten möchte, völlig vernichtet wird, wo alle Ketten zersprengt, alle Wünsche erfüllt sind, alle Sehnsucht gestillt ist, indem das selig erweiterte Gefühl sich in und mit dem All über allen Wechsel des irdischen Daseyns erhaben fühlt."

S. T. C.: "Thirty years ago in the Ode entitled France and in the last stanza ending with

O Liberty! my spirit felt thee there!

I express the same thought; and as a Poet, had a right so to do. But when this genial Flush is gone by, what answer has it left behind to the heart-withering Facts truly stated on p. 10?"

Since Steffens discusses on p. 10 the facts of determinism, or "Nothwendigkeit," Coleridge is obviously making a recantation of some literary importance. He explicitly abjures the romantic naturalism of his youth.

T. M. RAYSOR.

The Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett. By HENRY R. PLOMER and TOM PETER CROSS. The University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. 89.

One of the most considerable of the many services rendered to Spenser scholarship by the late Dr. F. I. Carpenter was his insistence on the need for a careful revision of the current biography of the poet. In his *Reference Guide* (1923) he announced that Mr. H. R. Plomer was at work upon Bryskett, and he included, in the *Guide*, certain memoranda secured through Mr. Plomer's aid, supplementing his own important article on Spenser in Ireland in *MP.* in 1922. We now have before us, in a book published by aid of funds left for the purpose by Dr. Carpenter, the results of Mr. Plomer's further investigations.

The book gives a clear portrait of an important member of Spenser's circle, and, indirectly, sounder means for judging the circumstances amid which Spenser lived when he was writing the *Faerie Queene*. To be sure, most of the evidence is indirect. Though Spenser and Bryskett were associated, the poet does not figure in the correspondence which Mr. Plomer has transcribed. Bryskett seems to have been a person of some consequence, in pretty constant communication with men of rank in the government. He spoke frankly his mind concerning the management of Irish affairs by Elizabeth's ministers. The letters of 1580-82, in particular, bear out Spenser's own interpretation of the problem, a chaos due to the failure of government "to goe thorough with the reformation." Repeatedly Bryskett complains of the astounding neglect of Grey. The climax is reached in the letter to Walsingham in May, 1582, in which Bryskett sums up bitterly his feeling: "What can be sayd but that the secrett Judgement of God hangeth over this soyle, that causeth all the best endeavor of those that labor the reformation thereof to come to naught."

These letters should be read by all students of Spenser's *View of Ireland* or of his defence of Grey in the fifth book of the *Faerie Queene*. They are correctives to the view expressed some years ago by Mr. H. S. V. Jones to the effect that the "strong medicine" of Machiavelli meant nothing to Spenser and that he dealt merely with philosophical abstractions. Mr. Plomer has unearthed many valuable matters by printing in full documents that appear only in abstracts, frequently with the omission of their most illuminating parts, in the Calendars of State Papers. The book throws light on the nature of the various offices which Spenser held,

though here, again, the testimony is indirect. We have no letters by Spenser, or to him. We have no direct reference to him or to his work. Bryskett had literary tastes but they are not revealed in his letters. He held many small offices; he complained much; but he had contacts apparently lacking to Spenser. How barren must have been the poet's life had it not been for his absorption in his great epic!

It is perhaps because of the paucity of materials that bear directly upon the external aspects of Spenser's biography that the authors are impelled to resort, rather too frequently, to the sort of conjecture that Mr. Carpenter deplored. For example, we are told on p. 35 that Captain Norris and Warren St. Leger "were two of the company who met under Bryskett's roof, as described in the *Discourse of Civil Life*." Yet the most that Messrs. Plomer and Cross can do with reference to this supposed meeting, important to us because Bryskett says that Spenser was of the party, is to give evidence that all the persons *might* have been present. This of course is far from proving that they *were* present, or that the narrative is not fictitious. Indeed, the admission (p. 80) that three years must have passed between the events of the first day and those of the third day inevitably arouses the suspicion that no such meeting ever took place. Apart from their analysis of the introductory parts of the *Discourse*, the authors attempt no systematic study of it. They do not, for example, take into account the fact, pointed out by Professor Erskine, that some of the speeches attributed to Spenser in the dialogue are translated from Giraldi, and that they represent sentiments which Spenser is pretty certain not to have held. The problem of the *Discourse* is by no means settled; the chapter dealing with it seems the least satisfactory of the book, although we have a right to expect, in a book titled as it is, as careful treatment of Bryskett's literary work as of the offices he held. As to the authenticity of the introductions to the parts of the dialogue, it must be remembered that Bruno, for example, introduced into similar dialogues references to persons whom he probably met in London, and he gives what appear to be accounts of real meetings of a philosophical group. Yet it would be a mistake to interpret these references literally. And Spenser himself, in *Colin Clout*, introduces dialogue in the same literary fashion, though we know that there was no such meeting as he describes. The *Discourse of Civil Life* has intimate relations to the plan and conduct of the *Faerie Queene*; it is a document of first importance in literary history; but we gain nothing by the speculation that it is a sort of short-hand report of discussions that actually took place while the *Faerie Queene* was in the making. The influence, I am inclined to think, is from the epic to the dialogue, not the reverse.

There are other evidences of a tendency to expand scanty materials or to preserve a largely fictitious connection with Spenser through speculation. Some of this is old gossip, such as the idea that Spenser lost a child at Kilcolman. Some of it is gratuitous, such as the statement that we have no record of their "many friendly meetings and heart to heart talks." If there is no record, why mention it? Indeed, the Bryskett revealed in these letters seems unlikely to have indulged in heart to heart talks, unless on the subject of his own fortunes. Even worse, in its revival of the biographical method which Carpenter justly condemned, is the quite unsupported statement (p. 61) that "If Bryskett was in London at the time of Spenser's death, we may be sure that he was not only at his bedside, but that he was one of the distinguished group of mourners . . . who . . . composed elegies and threw them into the grave together with the pens used in writing them."

In short it is for the documents themselves, hitherto inaccessible, that we are grateful for this book, and not for the interpretation of Spenser that is attempted. These documents have enabled the authors to construct a far more detailed biography than we can find elsewhere, not the least interesting part of which is the story of Bryskett's later years, based on the Salisbury MSS. at Hatfield House. Yet there are some omissions of available evidence even in this account. For example, there is no reference to the important fact that in 1590 Bryskett was granted two hundred pounds "for past services," the money to be paid out of the receipt of forfeitures of the Port of London (*C. S. P. Dom.*, 1581-90, p. 711), a record which may have some bearing on Bryskett's efforts to raise money for his debts as well as fees that he thought were due him. Again, in October of 1600, there is record of acquittance by Bryskett for one hundred pounds received from the secretary to Sir Robert Cecil (*C. S. P. Dom.*, 1598-1601, p. 482), to which I find no reference in the book. There are doubtless other clues in the domestic calendars; the authors appear to have confined their researches to the Irish state papers and to the Hatfield MSS.

The book shows evidence of haste in preparation. There is a serious typographical error in the third line of page 3, rendering the sentence unintelligible. The sentence near the top of page 15 is also in need of revision, and the sentence introducing the quotation at p. 17. We are told that the name of Elizabeth's Treasurer may be spelled in two ways; surely it is not too much to ask that the authors decide which spelling they prefer and then cleave to it. Yet we find the two spellings scattered quite impartially throughout the book, often in pairs on succeeding pages, as, for example, "Burleigh" on pages 13 and 29, followed by "Burghley" on pages 14 and 30. But the formula is reversed by "Burghley" on

p. 41 and "Burleigh" p. 43. The Spenser material, also, appears to have been got up hastily. It is a bit surprising to find Legouis almost solely depended upon as authority.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

La Science du Mot. A. CARNOY. Louvain, Editions "Universitas," 1927. Pp. vii + 426.

Those of us who had the good fortune, long years ago, to attend the lessons of Professor Michel Bréal at the Collège de France, can still recall the refreshing novelty of his discussions of the meanings of words, and their shifts of meaning. A genial skeptic on the subject of "phonetic laws," he saw a new and happily lawless field for linguists in that aspect of language which he christened "la Sémantique"; and finally he published an enlightening book under that title. Others have busied themselves more or less with the same sort of study, each from the point of view of his special interest. Notable is the work of Wundt, in his *Völkerpsychologie*; the names of Paul, Darmesteter, de Saussure, Nyrop, Vossler readily suggest themselves also. Yet none of these scholars has attempted a comprehensive exposition of the whole matter. Each has contented himself with culling curious specimens, or with gathering confirmative evidence for a particular doctrine. Even collectively, they have not made of Semantics a methodical science, to be considered on a par with Phonology and Morphology.

That task has been assumed by Professor Carnoy of the University of Louvain, a scholar well known for his writings on Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Romance. Personally, too, he is known to many Americans, having spent some time in this country during the dark days. His studies and travels have given him a rich and varied fund of illustration, which, of course, is the indispensable stock in trade of any dealer in general linguistics. With modest caution, he describes his effort as tentative; his desire is to assist in laying the foundations of a real science, with a definition, a method, and a terminology of its own.

The lack of a technical nomenclature Carnoy attempts to supply by means of a systematically invented vocabulary, constructed on the principles of Greek composition, and based on the word *séma*: for instance, *métasémie*, *métendosémie*, *ecsémie*, *prosémie*, *pêrisémie*, *aposémie*, etc. Some of these names either explain themselves or suggest a likely guess; others are unintelligible without explanation. The book is, however, so written that the reader does not need to memorize the strange terms, each of them being sufficiently defined whenever it occurs—a prudent course, since the terminology is the feature most exposed to objection. Yet when one works it

through, in the conspectus at the back of the volume, one hardly sees how it could be improved, provided one accepts the classification on which it is built. For the whole system hangs together.

The plan is conceived with the purpose of including eventually all aspects of signification and all modes of change. After a brief discussion of the origins of speech and the development of languages, the author takes up the relation of thought to expression, the associations that cluster about words, their grouping in hierarchies, the formation of derivatives. This static picture is a prelude to the real story, the dynamic process of growth. Two fundamental principles underly Carnoy's presentation. One is the assumption that men always have more notions than words, that the growth of vocabulary constantly lags behind the evolution of concepts. The other is the idea that alteration usually comes about through a shift of emphasis between the central significance of a word and some of its connotations. The range of association may be transferred; it may be increased; it may be diminished; certain connotations may be magnified at the expense of others; indeed, one of them may so well as to supplant the original head.

Through its multitudinous and devious currents Carnoy follows the course of semantic change, always instructively and acutely. This or that philologist may—undoubtedly will—be inclined to put this or that phenomenon into a different category. This or that foreigner may criticize the interpretation of a word or phrase cited from his own idiom; for many are the languages from which examples are drawn, although French is naturally in the lead. Such little disagreements are inevitable. But no one at all interested in the psychology of speech will read the book without finding abundant food for profitable thought.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Harvard University.

English Satire and Satirists. By HUGH WALKER, 1925, London: Dent, New York: Dutton. Pp. x + 325. \$2.25.

This new volume in the "Channels of English Literature" series is truly pioneer work.¹ As a manual for the student it will undoubtedly be serviceable. It gives due space to the various parts of the subject, and echoes the generally accepted judgments con-

¹ Since the days of Dryden there have been general essays on English satire. During the eighteenth century one might have read, for example, *An Essay on Satire* by Walter Harte (1730), *An Essay Towards Fixing the True Standards of Wit, Humour, Raillery, Satire, and Ridicule* by C. Morris (1744), *An Essay on the Use and Abuse of Satire* by Charles Abbot Tenterden (Oxford, 1786), or "An Essay on Satire" in G. A. Stevens' *Lecture on Heads* (Dublin, 1788). In the nineteenth century

cerning the merits of the principal satirists. Moreover, in all the chapters but the last it traces a fairly definite thread of progress.

But one seems to observe throughout the book one critical defect, an antipathy for the salient quality of satire, that "Satiric Spirit" which Mr. Walker capitalizes but condemns. He distrusts it so thoroughly that one constantly wonders at his perseverance in a study which must have caused him much pain. This aversion is everywhere apparent. In the excellent fifth and sixth chapters, which present a clear general view of Elizabethan satire, the lack of sympathy is suggested by the author's inclination to value the satirists for "geniality" and other personal virtues rather than for mastery of their caustic art. In the eighth, "Classical Satire to Dryden," it betrays the critic into apparent inconsistency. He expresses admiration for Dryden's "urbanity of manner" and, a few pages farther on, brands *Macflecnoe* as "the most severe of all personal satires in English."

The same unsympathetic approach makes Chapter X, on "Post-Restoration Prose Satire," thoroughly disheartening. It is true that Mr. Walker points out the notable figures in the mob of writers of satirical prose in the eighteenth century. But he either praises them for qualities that are not satiric, or condemns them for the very qualities of style and of thought that characterize truly great satire. Steele he applauds for geniality; Goldsmith for a trait indeed quaint in a satirist, "habitual kindness." He finds that in *Jonathan Wild the Great*

Fielding maintains the irony with a relentlessness that, truth to tell, makes the book extremely unpleasant reading; though he has sufficient mercy on his readers to drop hints of his real vein from time to time, and in the end makes Wild die on the scaffold while the simple and trusting Heartfree recovers his fortune and lives in love and happiness with his family. (p. 210.)

Of Junius he writes:

It must be confessed that the famous *Letters*, great as is their talent,

there was one notable essay, *English Satirical Writers in Prose and Poetry since 1500* by Arthur J. Sargent (Oxford and London, 1897). More recently came Mr. Oliphant Smeaton's useful "Introduction" for his collection of *English Satires* (1907), Mr. Gilbert Cannan's highly impressionistic *Satire* (1914), and the able monograph of Mr. C. W. Previt -Orton, *Political Satire in English Poetry* (Cambridge, 1910). There have also been a number of American doctoral dissertations in the field of English satire. Three of these are especially important: *Verse Satire in England before the Renaissance* by Samuel Marion Tucker (New York, 1908), *The Rise of Formal Satire under Classical Influence* by Raymond MacDonald Alden (Philadelphia, 1899), and *Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse* by Claude M. Fuess (New York, 1912). Until 1925, however, the only significant attempt to present a unified account of the whole history of English satire was that of James Hannay in his six lectures called *Satire and Satirists* (1854).

are unpleasant reading: venomous malignity and corrosive spite are qualities not beautiful to contemplate; and cold poison seems somehow to be more deadly than poison that is not cold. (p. 217).

A considerable part of the chapter is appropriately devoted to Swift. Concerning that tremendous pessimist, Mr. Walker seems convinced against his will. Two successive sentences from page 197 afford an extreme illustration of his attitude:

On the plea that he was unsound in mind Swift may be pitied, but not praised or admired.

There is no "brother near the throne" of Jonathan Swift: he is unrivalled among English prose satirists.

Imperfect sympathy likewise led the historian to deal somewhat perfunctorily with the satirists of the latter half of the eighteenth century, touching delicately the tainted verses of the dissipated Churchill, remarking on certain "stinging lines" of Cowper which are mere versified description of Hogarth's "Morning," rapidly disposing of such minor persons as Chatterton, Cambridge, Crabbe, "Peter Pindar," Gifford, Mathias, and the wits of the *Anti-Jacobin*, and utterly omitting the names of William Combe, William Mason, and Christopher Anstey, the author of the *New Bath Guide*.

Perhaps the most vivid demonstration of Mr. Walker's point of view is in his critical estimate of his fellow-Victorian, Thackeray:

Thackeray's heart pierced deeper than his head. He was stronger, not weaker, greater, not less, by reason of the restraints which the age laid upon him. *Jonathan Wild* would have been a far finer book than it is if Fielding had felt himself to be under similar restraints. . . . [The function of art] is to interpret the beautiful to men, and it may legitimately deal with the ugly only by way of showing up its opposite by contrast. (p. 299.)

In general, this book is the work of an optimist endeavoring to deal fairly with the history of a kind of writing that is almost inevitably pessimistic. It is task work rather than a labor of love, task work conscientiously performed by a scholar who has a constitutional distaste for sarcasm and harsh rebuke. His antipathy for the essential and distinguishing element of satire is unmistakably implied in such passages as:

In verse we instinctively expect beauty, and there is a reaction when we are disappointed and find instead censure; in prose the expectation is far less strong. (p. 113.)

Every form of literature is valued ultimately in proportion to the truth it embodies. Now romance embodies a deeper truth than realism—as the realists understand it. There is something of the Yahoo in humanity, but there is also something that responds to the *Serious Call*. . . . Satire is a relatively low form of literature, just because it embodies a relatively small element of truth. (p. 119).

The general plan of the "Channels" series has prevented Mr. Walker from annotating his text with more than a scant dozen footnotes. This limitation seems decidedly unhappy, for more copious and more accurate bibliographical notes would indubitably increase the usefulness of his book. In its present form, it is certainly not a definitive critical history of British satire. As a preliminary survey, however, it is a good book worthy to stand on the shelf beside M. Léon Levrault's *La Satire (Evolution du genre)*.

ROBERT C. WHITFORD.

Knox College.

An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology (Revised and Enlarged). By FREDERICK BLISS LUQUIENS. Pp. 148. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926.

This is the "second printing, second edition" of Professor Luquienes's useful manual for beginners in Old French, first published in 1909 and republished in a revised and enlarged edition in 1919. For a time the volume had been out of print. Since the work has been before the world of scholarship for more than fifteen years, it seems unnecessary to indicate its purpose and scope otherwise than by reference to the preface, where it is frankly stated that the book is a "skeletonized" translation of the Schwan-Behrens grammar, which—as Mr. Luquienes intimates—has gained and held a favored position as the basic working tool of Old French students. But the *Introduction* is more than that, for the author has added with a view to its use in our universities certain other material of an elementary character not available in the Schwan-Behrens work: an explanation of phonetic symbols; a glossary of technical terms used in philology; and a sketch of the organs of speech. He has likewise introduced two rather striking innovations, (1) the presentation of Old French verbs after the manner of grammars of Modern French, and (2) a system of drill-exercises for working out Old French etymologies that is invaluable as a device for fixing in the student's mind not only the principles involved but—almost literally—the location of every fundamental statement in Schwan-Behrens.

Undoubtedly some teachers of Old French hold the opinion that graduate students do not need (or perhaps even should not be permitted) the use of this sort of crutch, and with equal sincerity may maintain that the same amount of time might better be devoted to mastering the Schwan-Behrens itself. That has not been the reviewer's experience. In the first place, the student of Old French is often a first-year graduate student, who hasn't yet

learned how to work by himself. In the second place, he is frequently innocent not only of general linguistic ideas, but of a knowledge of phonetics or of the nature and purpose of philological study. In the third place, his knowledge of German—or even of French, in case the excellent French translation of Schwan-Behrens by M. Oscar Bloch is used—may not be sufficient to obviate entirely the technical difficulties of the original. In the fourth place, it seems to me desirable, as Mr. Luquiens has pointed out in the preface, to make it possible for students to acquire, before beginning to use the Schwan-Behrens, an “appreciation of its logicalness of structure,” which in the *Grammatik* itself, is “all but obscured by the complexities of detail unavoidable in an advanced grammar.” Finally, and perhaps principally, there seems to me to be a distinct saving of time, rather than a loss, in using the Luquiens book as a bridge. Students appear to get a better and earlier comprehension of the larger book, to use it more readily and systematically, after a study of the *Introduction*, than when they are literally pitchforked into a work of the importance, magnitude, and complexity of the Schwan-Behrens *Grammatik*.

Everyone knows, of course, that teachers of Old French ordinarily prepare the ground for the leap into philology, as represented by the Schwan-Behrens or some other Old French grammar, by a series of preliminary lectures which serve the same purpose as the Luquiens book. May one not ask, however, whether it is not needlessly adding to the burdens of graduate students—already too often reduced to the status of mere group-amanuenses—to compel them to take careful lecture-notes on material which is readily accessible in printed form? The preliminary meetings of the class might then be devoted to actual work with the tools of the craft rather than hurried note-taking and the accumulation of a mass of pre-digested material.

What is written above does not mean that the Luquiens manual is a perfect instrument for its purpose. The author himself never implies this and expressly invites the suggestions of its users. The reviewer offers the following:

1. Students could with profit be introduced by reference in the text, or, if that is impossible, by the inclusion of a brief bibliography, to such useful works as that of Jespersen on general linguistics, Ripman's convenient *Elements of Phonetics*, Bourciez's and Zauner's manuals of comparative Romance linguistics, Sturtevant's *Linguistic Change*, and others that will suggest themselves. Nyrop and Meyer-Lübke are mentioned in the preface. I believe that it would be especially helpful also to give not merely mention but considerable space to Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, a book which is not only scholarly and accurate but eminently usable and easily accessible. This suggestion is made with full

realization of the existence of complete bibliographies elsewhere, including of course the Schwan-Behrens grammar itself.

2. The text might well be enriched, within reasonable space-limits, by references to parallel developments in Italian or Spanish or Old Provençal, or even—for general linguistic phenomena—to English or “American.”

3. It would seem pedagogically desirable to list Classical Latin forms before Vulgar Latin forms both in the text and in the exercise-system of the appendix, rather than the reverse, not only because it is the chronological order, but because it is reasonable to assume that students—unless they have already had Vulgar Latin—will more readily recognize Classical Latin forms and meanings.

4. A little more material on Old French dialects might be included to advantage, in view of the importance of some of these dialects—for example, Picard, Champenois, Norman-French—in medieval literature and in view of the inclusion of the extremely valuable Part III (on dialects) in recent editions of Schwan-Behrens. This is a relatively unimportant point, however, because the study of O.F. dialects would naturally follow a thorough grounding in Central French.

5. I do not agree that the inclusion of an index would be “detrimental” to a solid comprehension of the logical structure of the Schwan-Behrens grammar and, by implication, of this book, as Mr. Luquiens affirms in his preface. On the part of anyone else, that statement would be a reflection on the value of his work. The logical structure of the treatise is beautifully clear as it stands; and the index-habit is one never to be discouraged, however potent the arguments against it may appear to be.

A few errors and misprints still remain. I have noted the following: p. 38, par. 84, O.F. *venur*, not *venire*; p. 42, par. 105, **capu* need not be starred, as *capus* is attested;¹ p. 45, par. 133, “pronunciation” is misspelled; p. 68, par. 282½, *plānte*, not *plānte*; *plāte*, not *plāte*; p. 87, par. 332, the cedilla is omitted in *igo* and *go* both in the heading and in the text; p. 96, a “Week (sic) conjugation” would be a rarity indeed; p. 99, l. 1, supply a hyphen at the end of the line.

In conclusion, may I not express my belief that the book has more than justified its existence and the painstaking labor that its author has put into it; and further voice the hope that it may prosper to such an extent that a third and further revised edition may become feasible.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE.

George Washington University.

¹ But not **capum*. See Grandgent. *op. cit.*, par. 285.

The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra. By RAPHAEL LEVY.
The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and
Languages, Vol. VIII, 1927. 172 pp.

The study of Judeo-Romance lexicography received its first impetus from E. Bohmer and A. Darmesteter in the early seventies; they were followed by such men as Schlessinger, Gruenwald, Lambert, and Brandin. This field of research has recently been brought to a considerable degree of development through the labors of Professor D. S. Blondheim, who is probably the scholar best qualified today to direct investigations in this subject. It is under his direction that Mr. Levy prepared this dissertation, with frequent aid from other authorities. The work is divided into two main divisions: a discussion of the complete astrological writings of Abraham ibn Ezra (b. 1089-d. 1167), a Spanish Jew who traveled extensively, as well as of the translations of his works; secondly, a glossary of the words used in the French translation of Abraham's "Beginning of Wisdom," made by Hagin li Juis. This translation was dictated to a scribe, Obert de Montdidier, in the house of Henri Bate, at Malines during the month of December, 1273.

The first division contains an accurate and extremely interesting discussion of all that pertains to Abraham ibn Ezra. I have only one important criticism: the distribution of emphasis could be better. Mr. L. might have arranged his material somewhat differently to bring out the importance of Hagin. As it is, we feel that he lies buried under Abraham and the Latin translator Petrus de Abbano. Too much space, perhaps, is given to the latter.

The second division is of great value. It lists a number of words completely lacking and others ill defined in Godefroy and the various *lexiques*. There is also supplementary information on certain words correctly treated in Godefroy. Of the first class we should mention *agabois* 'mockery,' *chauvissure* 'baldness,' *milonnenetes* 'mediation,' *omeur* 'odor,' *vermelesce* 'vermilion,' and *vision* 'face.' There are five of these words which are of a sexual nature. In the second and third groups we are attracted particularly by *accomençal* 'beginning,' *aprevostir* 'to appoint as head,' *bonigier* 'to do good,' *eigier* 'to cultivate,' and *emploial* 'end.' Each word in this glossary is defined and followed by the corresponding word in the Latin translation of Petrus, also by the Hebrew original of Abraham. Unfortunately the few Arabic words used by Hagin are dismissed as such and Mr. L. makes no effort to qualify them. They are *alaas* 'adamant,' *alsaeri* 'Syrius,'¹ *Samach alazel* 'Spica Virginis,' *samach alremarh* 'Arcturus,' and *altamesaih* 'crocodile.' The correct Arabic forms, which Mr. L.

¹ For information on the Arabic star names cf. *Ulugh Beg's Catalogue of Stars*, ed. by E. B. Knobel, Carnegie Institute, Washington 1917.

does not give, are: *al-mās*, *as-si'rā*, *as-simāk al-'āzal*, *as-simāk ar-rahmih*, and *at-timsah* (pl. *at-tamāsih*). The corrupted medical terms used by Hagin all resemble corrupted Greek more than Arabic. The printing of this book is excellent, as we have come to expect in the Johns Hopkins Studies.

URBAN T. HOLMES.

University of North Carolina.

Rambles with Anatole France. By SÁNDOR KÉMERI (Mme Georges Bolóni), translated from the Hungarian by EMIL LENGYEL. Philadelphia and London, J. P. Lippincott Company, 1926. 335 pp.

The title of Mme Bölöni's book, *Rambles with Anatole France*, is no misnomer. In the opening chapters we meet France at Villa Saïd and accompany him on a pilgrimage to his habitual haunts in Old Paris. Then we pass to Italy where the Master goes to free himself from his depressing thoughts after the death of Mme de Caillavet in 1910. The concluding chapters are devoted to a meeting of France and Rodin at Villa Saïd, to the former's trip to South America in 1909, and a visit paid to him by Mme Bölöni after the war.

The author of the present volume was secretary to France during the months which followed the death of Mme de Caillavet, an important period in the novelist's career; therefore, her book promised to be interesting from more than one standpoint. We regret that Mme B. has not thought it possible or fitting to lift the veil of mystery spread about the relations of France and Mme de Caillavet during the last years of the latter's life. However, the short allusion made to this obscure point in France's biography is pregnant with meaning in spite of its reticence. The words "cruel feeling of self-reproach," "self-accusing grief," "soul's doubts" used to describe the master's state of mind carry with them a certain weight of evidence. We find in them a confirmation of what Mme Jeanne Maurice Pouquet would have us infer from the sad tone of the last pages of her *Salon de Madame Arman de Caillavet*, 1926. The details of the problem, however, are still to be unravelled.

Mme B.'s book reflects a certain originality of view inasmuch as she emphasizes in the character of France an element which the other biographers have merely touched upon. In her *Rambles*, France is not only a sensual lover of life and beauty, a humanist and sceptic, but also an intensely introspective and sentimental nature, assailed by gloomy moods. The stress laid here is not in accord with the previous character studies of the master. A few cursory

remarks will show quite convincingly that the sentimental element in France's character has been considerably exaggerated. In 1910, he was working on *Les dieux ont soif* and *La révolte des anges*, which are among the most brutal and cynical of his novels and additional circumstantial evidence contrary to her contention can be gleaned from Mme B.'s own book, for her style is not one which wins us by its naturalness and simplicity. Highly florid and prolix, it bears the stamp of a sentimental and effusive nature. This accounts most likely for her sketching so novel a portrait of France. An ardent admirer of the novelist, she has seen him through herself, in the mirror of her own feelings. Practically every chapter is permeated with shallow and morbid moralizations. Bathos and unrestrained emotionalism know no bound in the story of *The Little Red Coat*. The chapters entitled *In the Forest of Dante*, *Two Old Friends Meet* (Rodin and France), and certain portions of the pages *On the Pincio of Rome*, if taken at face value, would afford numerous and conclusive manifestations of a complete moral disintegration and of an absolute lack of intellectual virility on the part of one of the most serene of contemporary French thinkers. For instance, in Naples, the master cannot bear the sight of lambs with slashed throats (161). Brought to consciousness by a green lizard creeping on the earth, in the forest of Dante, he falls into a melancholy mood and ends with the resolution not to be sentimental (p. 229). At another time, he feels an irrepressible desire to visit the cathedral at Rheims, expressing his fear that it might be damaged by an earthquake or a furious tempest, or that he might go blind or die (p. 281). According to Mme B., France "knew why his hands were interesting,—from work, meditation, and suffering." He once told her so (p. 297).

Is the man of these moods the creator of the bloody Evariste Gamelin, the violent satirist of *L'île des pingouins*, the strenuous Cyclops who, but for his cynical commiseration, would have enveloped humanity and its sordidness in one mighty act of all-consuming contempt? Of course, we cannot deny the presence of a pronounced streak of genuine melancholy in the author of *Le crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*, *Abeille*, *Le livre de mon ami*, *Le lys rouge*, and *Crainquebille*, but until now, we have been used to consider the sceptical mood as most characteristic of him. So long as we possess no indisputable evidence to the contrary, we shall continue to consider the humanist and sceptic to be the true Anatole France. To the rather gentle and romantic figure with which Mme B. makes us acquainted, we prefer the coarser and pettier master of Brousson and of Le Goff, a man marred with more shortcomings but living most intensely and possessing a most complex personality.

J. M. CARRIÈRE.

Marquette University.

Acta Philologica Scandinavica. Tidsskrift for nordisk sprogforskning. Udgivet med understøttelse af Rask-Ørsted Fondet af Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen og Lis Jacobsen under medvirkning af Bengt Hesselman Uppsala, Finnur Jónsson København, Axel Kock Uppsala, Sigurður Nordal Reykjavík, Magnus Olsen Oslo, Hugo Pipping Helsingfors. I Aargang Gyldendalske Boghandel København 1927.

We have here to welcome a periodical started at Copenhagen and appearing quarterly with approximately 100 large octavo pages, printed on fine paper with beautiful type, intended to deal with Scandinavian philology ancient and modern.

The chief editors, Professor Brøndum-Nielsen and Dr. Lis Jacobsen, are philologists of acknowledged merits, especially in the field of Danish philology proper; and the collaborators are among the greatest authorities in Scandinavian (Norse) philology in each of the five Scandinavian countries, respectively, at the present time. Furthermore, it seems, in order to add still more dignity to the titlepage, the pictures of three great scholars of times past, viz. the famous Dane R. Kr. Rask, the Swede J. Ihre, and the Norwegian S. Bugge, are placed in a circle in a brotherly fashion below the prominent scholars of our own day. Here one may ask, "Why was the Icelandic Sveinbjörn Egilsson, author of *Lexicon poeticum antiquae linguae septentrionalis*, excluded from this 'limbus patrum'?" I, for one, think that he well deserved a place there as the first scientific interpreter of the dark scaldic poetry of Old Norse. But this is not essential, of course. What is essential is the way in which the editors keep the promise of the title page. One may get a little notion of that by glancing at the contents of volume 1.

There are, in the first place, articles dealing with the language and the ethnology of the ancient Germans (Teutons), e.g. Professor G. Neckel's "Germanische Syntax," Professor T. E. Karsten's "Zur Kenntnis der ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter des Ostseefinnischen," and Dr. S. Feist's "Neuere Germanenforschung." And there are articles on the Scandinavian runic monuments, by Dr. E. Noreen: "L'inscription runique des Bractéates de Äscatorp et Väsby," and the splendid one by Dr. Lis Jacobsen herself: "Wimmer's Farmerstones," further articles deal with history of language and etymology; by Professor D. A. Seip, "Reduzierter Vokal nach kurzer Stammsilbe im Altnorwegischen"; by Dr. E. Wessén, "Notes pour servir à l'histoire de quelques mots Suédois"; and by Professor R. E. Zachrisson, "OE *dæn(n)* M. Dutch *dan* and the name of *Danemark*" (recording among other things a number of Old and Middle English placenames containing this element).

Then there are two studies in Scandinavian textual questions ancient and modern: Professor R. C. Boer's "Studien über die Snorra Edda. Die Geschichte der Tradition bis auf den Archetypus," and Professor H. Brix's "The Earliest Impressions of Holberg's Comedies."

There are still other contributions, of which I shall mention only that of the American scholar Professor T. G. Flom: "The Writing of *n* and *nn* in hand iii. of the *Þiðreks saga*," and the interesting little article of the Englishman E. V. Gordon: "Scarborough and Flamborough," in which he tries to identify the founders of those towns with the Icelandic vikings, the poet *Kormákr* and his brother *Þorgils skarði*.

Finally, there is a "Bibliography of Scandinavian Philology" for 1925-26 by Mag. art. Paul Andersen and Mag. art. Harry Andersen on the basis of reports sent in by the authors of the works cited.

The new periodical is to be recommended to everybody who is interested in Scandinavian philology, and particularly to Americans, because it is the only periodical in the field exclusively using the more widely known languages of English, French, and German. And certainly it is a pity that an English-speaking philologist should not be able to get acquainted with his Scandinavian colleagues, for in their scientific method they are second to none, so that one may often read their works with profit, even if the problems they are discussing are only of secondary interest.

S. EINARSSON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

EDWARD FITZGERALDS *Rubaiyat des Omar Khayyam*. Letzte Fassung, deutsch von H. W. NORDMEYER. Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag Potsdam, 1926.

This new German version of the famous English masterpiece once characterized by Charles Eliot Norton as "not a copy, but a reproduction, not a translation, but the re-delivery of a poetic inspiration" is a contribution by an American university teacher to the literature of his native land. Intimate living contact of its author with the language of the original is thus assured before we open its pages. The fulfilment of the second prerequisite of a translation of a great work of literature, that it should always be a labor of love, inspired by aesthetic and spiritual kinship with the original, is doubly attested by the author's introduction. It proves him both a profound inquirer into the philosophy of the

Persian poet-sage and an ardent admirer of FitzGerald as the incomparable modern interpreter and poetic re-creator of Omar's moods and thoughts.

Now as to the translation itself as a work of art. After a most favorable first impression, the reviewer has compared it carefully, line by line, with the original and the best of previous German renderings. In his judgment, Nordmeyer comes nearer than any of his predecessors to satisfying the third, and most essential *sine qua non*, literary excellence and charm without undue sacrifice of fidelity to the original in content and form. He alone among German translators has attained a perfect reproduction of the rhythmic structure of the original. Its masculine rhymes as well as the masculine ending of the third, normally "silent" line are everywhere preserved; not, indeed, as easy task in German. Where, for once, FitzGerald himself departs from this scheme, his interpreter, with true artistic instinct, avoids an irregularity which, while accepted in an original masterpiece, might easily mar a translation. Needless to say, this rhythmic superiority of Nordmeyer's version might also have proved a handicap. It is the more admirable that, taking the various translations as a whole, none is equal to Nordmeyer's in its fidelity to the English text or in poetic beauty and appeal. Among the numerous quatrains which the reviewer has starred in his copy, the 20th may serve to exemplify how far Nordmeyer has succeeded in transfusing poetic beauty from one language into another:

Und dieses duftge Grün, das weichbeschwingt
den Saum des Ufers da wir ruhn umringt—
O lehne linde hin . . . wer weisz wie süsz
die Lippe war, der es vielleicht entspringt. . . .

A few marginal queries in the reviewer's copy indicate that here and there he believes the skill and resourcefulness of such a translator capable of a still closer approach to the original. In two instances he would certainly suggest a revision. In quatrain 59 the rendering of FitzGerald's *with logic absolute* by *folgernd unbeirrt* seems somewhat strained and, at first, even a bit obscure. And in quatrain 73 which, quite in keeping with those immediately preceding, stresses the eternal immutability of predestined fate, Nordmeyer's last two lines

Wahrlich, der Schöpfung erstes Fröhrot schrieb
was keiner liest bis zum Posaunenton!,

while impressive in themselves, are not an adequate rendering of

And the first Morning of Creation wrote
What the Last Dawn of Reckoning shall read.

This grandiose conception of immutability, reminding one vividly

of Spitteler's *Ananke* in his *Olympischer Frühling*, seems here weakened into one of mere inscrutability. The translator, no doubt, had no such intention, but his last line certainly is alien to the dominant thought of the quatrain, well brought out in the first line of Bodenstedt's translation from the original Persian: *Urewig vorgezeichnet ist der Dinge Kern*.

The beautifully printed and bound little volume bears the dedication: A. R. Hohlfeld in Madison, Wisconsin in Verehrung und Dankbarkeit zugebracht. It would not be amiss if future editions of this admirable translation went beyond this mere intimation of its German-American origin.

A. W. BOESCHE.

Cornell University.

The Child Actors. By HAROLD NEWCOMB HILLEBRAND. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XI, Nos. 1, 2; 1926. Pp. 355.

The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. By THOMAS WHITFIELD BALDWIN. Princeton University Press, 1927. Pp. xii+464.

These two books are significant signs of the interest in environing conditions of the Elizabethan drama, especially those so far the least investigated, the business management and the actors.

Professor Hillebrand's materials, methods, and problems are of a type more familiar than Professor Baldwin's. His new materials are mainly records of lawsuits, his problems those of company history. An introductory chapter emphasizes the advantage of child actors in shows and pageants. Succeeding chapters present the history of the various children's companies, not so much giving a detailed account as correcting and supplementing what has already been done. One mistake corrected may be mentioned in even so brief a review as this because it is so common: Harvey's irony in calling Lyly vicemaster of Paul's has been taken seriously; there never was such an office. Professor Hillebrand's new materials are mainly papers in several lawsuits, none of fundamental importance perhaps, but all illuminating, especially as to the history of the Children of the Queen's Revels about 1604. He calls attention also to a previously known but little used lawsuit of 1623, which shows that Philip Henslowe and probably Edward Alleyn were not opposed to but actively concerned in Rossiter's theater at Puddlewharf in the Blackfriars. Among other valuable matters are an unusually full discussion of Sebastian Westcote, including an ascription to him of *The Contention of Liberty and*

Prodigality; denial of Wallace's theory that Udall wrote *Jacob and Esau* but a tentative ascription to him of *Jack Juggler*; argument against Fleay's idea that *Luke Will to Luke* was the cause of Edward's turning from comedy; proof that the second Blackfriars did not open till 1600; and so on. The most generally interesting chapter is the last, which summarizes the place and importance of the child actors. From 1515-80 they led in the development of the drama in England. In these years the principal plays were written for them by their masters, and were within their powers. But from 1600-16 the children's companies were only apes to the men's. The drama had gone on to heights of dramatic and tragic intensity where the children could not follow. Their authors, professional playwrights, turned to satiric comedy, and satire was their undoing. In an appendix, besides reprinting some of his new documents, Professor Hillebrand gives a complete and helpfully annotated chronological list of plays given by children.

The book is attractively written, it is based on wide and careful research, and its evidence is clearly and reasonably presented. The subject is both confusing and important, and the book is a useful assistance in clearing it up.

Professor Baldwin has found a subject concerning Shakespeare on which almost nothing has been done. Theoretically everybody has admitted the powerful influence which must be exerted upon any dramatist who writes continuously for a permanent company. But nobody until Professor Baldwin has treated the matter thoroughly as it affected Shakespeare.

One reason for this neglect is, perhaps, that it requires a really unusual combination of careful research, skilful inference, and historic imagination to secure any results. Professor Baldwin has brought to the problem all three. In his first chapters he discusses the organization and business management of Shakespeare's company, which he presents as a true guild, with masters, journeymen, and apprentices, slightly modified by the exigencies of operating a theater. Thus there were the housekeepers, who owned the theater, some of whom were also actors; the actors—about 1595 nine of them, later twelve; the apprentices, apprenticed at about the age of ten to individual members of the company, playing the women's parts till they were too old to continue them, and graduating at about twenty-one to become members of the company if there were at the time vacancies in their "lines"; and the hired men, including the players of lesser parts, the musicians, and that important personage, the prompter. Perhaps Professor Baldwin's basic point is that this organization was a stable and permanent one; even the hired men remained with the company for years. It was indeed more than a guild; it was a clan, an organization of friends, who not only worked together, but lived as neighbors to each other.

It is this permanency of organization that permits further inferences. On the basis of available actor-lists and contemporary connections of certain actors with certain parts, Professor Baldwin works out "lines" of parts, and follows them through Shakespeare's plays. His lists in which he assigns to definite actors the parts in the plays given by Shakespeare's company of Beaumont and Fletcher, Jonson, and Shakespeare are admirable condensations of information. He makes little of the doubling of parts of which Julia Engelen makes so much in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1926 (to be continued in 1927); perhaps this should be more taken into account, but it could not have much affected the principal roles. Some of Professor Baldwin's assignments are admittedly made on very slight grounds, and he has had to proceed much by inference. He also makes much use of hints in the text concerning the personal appearance and age of the characters. Even allowing for make-up, he thinks that day-light and the close proximity of the audience would lead Shakespeare to depend upon it as little as possible.

On the whole his conclusions carry conviction. It is a little difficult to see one man (Thomas Pope) as Mercutio, Falstaff, Petruchio, Shylock, Benedick, Casca, Jacques, Iago, and Gloucester in *King Lear*, but the author argues his case well. And even if one does question such individual lists, the general conclusions seem sound enough and are of fundamental importance. Shakespeare was the hired dramatist of the company. He had to meet its desires and suit its powers, and carefully to adapt his plays to his actors. Each play had to have a definite number of leading parts; speaking generally, up to 1594 five were necessary; later, as apprentices became trained, more were added. For apprentices still in training, Shakespeare had to adapt his women's parts to their developing powers. The clown's parts for Kemp—this has been pointed out before—had to differ from those for Armin who succeeded him. About this time, also, the acting powers of the company became more predominantly tragic than comic, and we have the series of great tragedies—a more credible explanation than the old "out of the depths" or gloom over the machinations of the "dark lady." And when the company took over the Blackfriars they tried to hold the audience by carrying on the sort of plays to which Beaumont and Fletcher had accustomed it, and we have Shakespeare's tragi-comedies. Professor Baldwin is not so foolish as to offer these as the only explanation of Shakespeare's different types of plays, nor to deny his own great influence upon the company, but certainly their influence upon him has never before been so adequately estimated.

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS.

University of Colorado.

Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock. Von G. C. L. SCHUCHARD. Tübinger Germanistische Arbeiten. Zweiter Band. W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1927.

Die umsichtigen Studien Schuchards geben ein im Ganzen überzeugendes Bild von der Bedeutung und Behandlung des Hexameters zur Zeit Klopstocks. Die Minderwertigkeit der Versgebung der ersten drei Gesänge des *Messias* erklärt er mit Recht aus der Schwierigkeit, welche eine Umschmelzung der Prosafassung mit sich brachte. Verse derselben Jahre, wenn freigeschaffen, sind einwandfrei. Dabei führt in der Entwicklung des Dichters eine souveräne Behandlung des Metrums zu freien Rhythmen, während später eine strengere Schematisierung (wie das übrigens im reifen Alter durchaus natürlich ist) einsetzt und zugleich ein Hang zu Inversion und den unglücklichen 'Spondäen.'

Eine Schwäche der Arbeit Schuchards liegt in der bewußten Ausschaltung des Melodischen. Während ich die ersten 60 Seiten fast ohne Widerspruch las, solange ich nämlich den *Messias* nicht selbst zur Hand hatte, drängten sich mir im Zusammenhange der Verse sofort zahlreiche Abweichungen von Schuchards Tongebung auf. *Messias* II, 820-821 sind meinem Empfinden nach durchaus keine so schweren Verstöße, wenn man sie nicht wie der Verfasser liest:

Gótt, Verderber der Wésen, die du óhn' ihr Wóllen erschúfest!

Ríef er ím Hínabsehn, doch da wúrdé kein tótdendes Féuer.

sondern

Gótt, Verderber der Wésen, die dú ohn ihr Wóllen erschúfest!

Ríef er im Hínabsehn, doch da wúrdé kein tótdendes Féuer.

Die Betonung der Präposition 'ohn,' sowie die Verurteilung solcher Formen wie 'daurte,' 'feyrten,' 'feyrlichen' ließen vermuten, daß der Verfasser von süddeutscher Akzent- und Melodiegebung ausginge. Außerdem wird er aber—wie sein Lehrer Heusler—der häufigen Gegenwirkung der Tonstufen nicht gerecht. Hochton auf 'Mut' und 'Er' und schematischer Akzent auf 'und' machen aus den folgenden beiden Reihen durchaus annehmbare Verse:

III, 153. Jésum vielleícht. Mut] und ein kühnes entschlóssenes Wésen.

III, 517. Sálem ságt es und schwíég. Er] und die Séraphim blíeben.

Die tonale Kurzatmigkeit der ersten drei *Messias*gesänge (Mangel an langen Tonbögen und monotones Absinken) steht im stärksten Gegensatz zu dem auftönigen Spannen der Melodie selbst über die Verseinheit hinaus in den späteren. Ich vermute, daß gerade von dieser Seite her das Problem sich noch weit vertiefen ließe, und

hoffe, daß der Verfasser in der versprochenen Weiterführung seiner Untersuchungen die melodischen Hilfsmittel Mut und nicht mit Heuslerscher Einseitigkeit auch ferner ausschalten wird.

Johns Hopkins University.

ERNST FEISE.

Die Bedeutungsgleichheit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (-lice) (= Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 62), von DR. KARL UHLER, Heidelberg, 1926.

In this monograph, Dr. Karl Uhler attempts to prove that Old English Adjectives and Adverbs ending respectively in *-lic* and *-lice* are substantially identical in meaning with the corresponding simple (uncompounded) words; that, for example, there is no appreciable difference in meaning between the Old English adjectives *riht* and *rihtlic* or between the Old English adverbs *rihte* and *rihtlice*. On this question two opposing views had been held, according to Dr. Uhler (pp. 5-7). Dr. Moritz Scheinert, in his article, "Die Adjektiva im Beowulfepos als Darstellungsmittel" (Paul und Braune's *Beiträge*, xxx, 1905, pp. 345-430), § 161, held that the adjectival form in *-lic* indicated a weakening of the meaning of the corresponding simplex, as in the New High German *ärmlich* and *röthlich* as compared with *arm* and *roth*. On the other hand, Jakob Grimm (III, 122) thought that there was no appreciable difference in meaning between the simple and the compound of such adverbial pairs as *rihte* and *rihtlice*. Dr. Uhler's monograph is the first detailed attempt to settle the question at issue.

For his theory of the substantial identity of meaning between these simples and compounds Dr. Uhler offers several cogent reasons. In otherwise almost identical passages, he finds the simple and the compound forms used interchangeably, as in Wulfstan's *Homilies*, 73. 8 (and *riht* is, ðæt ælc cristen man eac oðerne lufie and healde mid rihte) as compared with the *A. S. Laws*, 473. 31 (and ðonne is *rihtlic* eac, ðæt ure ælc oðerne healde mid rihte), for the adjective; or in Alfred's *Boethius*, 135. 8 ff. (ac on ðam hi habbað genoh to ongitanne, ðæt se scippend and se waldend eallra gesceafta welt and *rehte* gesceop eall ðæt he gesceop beside 125. 26 ff. of the same text (ac ðu ne scealt no twiogan, ðæt swa good sceppend and waldend eallra gesceafta *rihtlice* gesceop eall ðæt he gesceop), for the adverb. Sometimes this interchange is found within the same sentence, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 176. 11 ff. (and on oðre wisan sint to manianne ða ðe ða word ðære halgan æ *ryhte* ne ongietað, on oðre ða ðe hie *ryhtlice* ongietað).

Again, Dr. Uhler cites numerous examples of such interchange of simple and of compound in passages that are similar though not identical, as in the *A. S. Laws*, 40. 43 (denn ðu *rihte* and swiðe emne) as contrasted with Ælfrie's *Homilies*, II, 322. 2 (ge manna bearn, demað *rihtlice*); or in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 184. 10 ff. (ðonne mon ðonne ongiete ðæt he *ryhte* gedemed habbe) and 44. 20 (gif him ðonne God *ryhtlice* and streclice deman wille), in each of which latter passages God is the subject, in whose correctness of judgment no diminution is possible.

At times one manuscript has the simplex, and another has the compound, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 138. 24 (Hatt. MS.: swiðe *ryhte* was ðæm sacerde forboden, ðæt he his heafod sceare; Cott. MS.: swiðc *ryhtlice* was ðæm sacerde forboden, ðæt he his heafod sceare).

Finally, according to Dr. Uhler, often the same Latin word is translated now by the simplex and now by the compound, as *recte* by *rihte* and *rihtlice* (*op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff.), sometimes within the same sentence, as in Alfred's *Pastoral Care*, 176. 11 (*op. cit.*, p. 52), already quoted by me. At times, too, the superlative of a Latin adverb (*manifestissime*) is translated by the form in *-lice* (*sweetollice*), as in Alfred's *Bede*, 639. 2025 (*op. cit.*, p. 55).

It is unfortunate, I think, that Dr. Uhler takes next to no account of this idiom in Old English poetry, and that he does not give full citations for his construction in the large number of Old English prose works investigated by him. And a statistical table, not, as given by him, of a few words only, but of all the words considered by him, would be helpful.

But, despite these shortcomings, this monograph is a sound piece of work, distinguished by clarity of statement and of arrangement and by sanity of judgment. Dr. Uhler has made highly probable his thesis that these adjectives and adverbs have substantially the same meaning whether with or without the suffix (*-lic*, *-lice*).

University of Texas.

MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.

Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith.

By MARY ALICE WYMAN, Ph. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927. viii + 249 pp. \$3.00.

In addition to providing (pp. 233-242) a very full and apparently accurate Bibliography of the numerous writings of Mr. and Mrs. Seba Smith, once of Portland, Maine, and later of New York City, this volume by Miss Wyman serves two useful purposes. It further illustrates the international nature of literature, and it helps to fill in the background behind our more prominent nineteenth century American writers.

The influence of *Junius* of mysterious British fame upon *The Life and Writings of Major Jack Downing of Downingville, away Down East in the State of Maine* (1833) is properly emphasized; and, with the chronological arrangement interestingly reversed, Mrs. Smith's antecendence of Ibsen's *Doll's House* by over twenty-five years is demonstrated. From 1825 for over forty years, Mr. and Mrs. Seba Smith, in American newspapers, magazines, and books, followed, echoed, and at times preceded, European literary styles, fashions, thoughts, and schools, in a way that obliterates all national boundaries. As Miss Wyman remarks, "in their connections with important people and movements of their day, they open up an interesting chapter of a period that has passed." Accounts of the contacts with Emerson and Thoreau, and of the relations with Edgar Allan Poe, are all valuable minor additions to American literary history.

In dealing with the two pioneers themselves, Miss Wyman preserves a commendably humble judgment of their worth, and frankly speaks of "needing a searchlight in surveying the group of minor writers in Portland"; and not often does she fall into the habit too common among those who write about less significant figures, of padding her pages with extraneous but more readable material. Yet, after stating that "Seba Smith admits that he himself was not at the dinner" given in New York to Charles Dickens in 1842, she includes an account of the dinner, of the decorations of the Park Theatre, and of Philip Hone and "the nine cheers from nearly three thousand throats." Ought Dickens be forced to supply background for a man who "was not at the dinner"? Nor is the attempt made to establish any unwarranted claims for literary merit in the works of either. Seba's output is frankly admitted to be weak in form and structure, and the London *Anthenaeum* (Jan. 6, 1849) is quoted without contradiction to the effect that "love of the tawdry seems to have infected American writers Mrs. Oakes Smith is thoroughly in the fashion." Miss Wyman's care in giving an accurate account of the two Maine literary pioneers is well illustrated by the story of the Downing letters, and by her history of the resuscitation in 1840 of Major Downing, who, like Sir Roger de Coverley, had been killed by his author.

Many of the most interesting passages in the life of Mrs. Smith are given in her own words, taken from *Selections from the Autobiography of Elizabeth Oakes Smith*. This little-known book (161 pp.), edited by Miss Wyman, and published (1924) by the Lewiston Journal Company, of Lewiston, Maine, contains three illustrations showing Mrs. Smith at various ages. The *Autobiography* naturally furnishes more entertaining reading than the *Two American Pioneers*.

CARL J. WEBER.

Colby College.

A Chaucer Handbook. By ROBERT DUDLEY FRENCH, New York, 1927. Pp. xi, 394.

Chaucer. By GEORGE H. COWLING, London, 1927. Pp. viii, 223.

Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences. By WALTER CLYDE CURRY, New York, 1926. Pp. xxii, 267.

Chaucer: The Nun's Priest's Tale. Edited KENNETH SISAM, Oxford, 1927. Pp. xlv, 82.

One who sets out to write a handbook of Chaucer has a rather difficult choice to make. He may follow Pollard or Root or Wells in simply stating the facts as straightforwardly as is consistent with readability, or Kittredge in combining criticism and scholarship. Professor French writes (as he says) for the "mature student of Chaucer,"—writes agreeably, but deprecates "aesthetic criticism," and so risks the disappointment both of scholars and of critics. For example, he has nearly four pages on the *Hous of Fame*, of which only one page touches the really important question: what the poem is actually about. He restates the theory of Immelmann (whose theories are usually wrong) and that of Manly, and quotes Sypherd at some length. He adds nothing for the mature student. He covers the intricate problem of the two Prologues of the Legend in eight or ten sentences. He devotes fifty-six pages to the *Troilus*, all but two of which are on the sources (mainly a very full summary of the *Filostrato*), and offers the mature student no helps of general criticism, maugre the æsthetic. The paragraph on Lollius must have been written before Professor Kittredge's thorough study (1917), though the latter is listed in the Bibliography. In a word, the *Handbook* is proper for an undergraduate class in Chaucer; the more mature student will want something more substantial.

Professor Cowling apparently wishes to popularize his poet. He is of course acquainted with the scholarship of his subject, and he refers wittily to "some modern academic investigators." But his book is full of unexpected statements, such as that the *Troilus* "is the only long poem which the poet ever completed to his own satisfaction" (pp. 112-13), or that "*Troilus and Criseyde* is not a book for the young" (p. 118). He finds that "in the absence of the evidence of facts, it is profitable to linger" over such speculations as "How Chaucer resolved to be poet" (p. 76), suggests that *Sir Thopas* ridicules one of Chaucer's own "early efforts," and submits an imaginary dialogue between Froissart and Chaucer, "however inadequately" written (in the best manner of Sir Walter). There are worse things in the book than these, and some which are better. The time-honored misconception of Milton's "simple, sensuous, and passionate" dictum is repeated with fresh

variations, and there is a considerable effort made to demonstrate that Chaucer was a poet; but the discussion of the *Troilus*, though brief, is interesting, the running account of the *Canterbury Tales* is adequate for the 'popular' reader, and the closing pages contain some sound (on the whole) if not brilliant criticism.

The reprinting, with amplifications, of Professor Curry's recent articles makes a convenient little book, though one must insist that what should have been footnotes have been maliciously printed as an appendix; and that the omission of an index of names and subjects, and of passages annotated is a serious error which greatly diminishes the usefulness of the work. Much of the volume is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Chaucer's familiarity with the mediaeval sciences and his frequent use of them. Other portions are open to question. Chaucer's description of the Pardoner, for instance, as beardless and high-voiced and under suspicion of being "a gelding or a mare" Professor Curry takes as a text for discussing the ancient and mediaeval beliefs concerning *eunuchi ex nativitate*, virtually identifies the Pardoner with a certain Favorinus of Arles (known to students of Lucian), and proceeds to a new interpretation of the famous psychological crux at the end of the Tale. Interesting, but still less persuasive is his presentation of the Wife of Bath as the embodiment of a horoscope: it is one thing to use astrology for illustration, it is quite another to put the cart before the horse. There is not space here to argue, however; and Professor Curry does put forward his contentions with all due modesty.

Mr. Sisam's school-text of the *Nun's Priest's Tale* is eminent in all respects for its practical usefulness, its attractive make-up (the presswork, however, leaves something to be desired), and its common-sense treatment of many questions both fundamental and incidental,—notably the choice of matters to present to beginners, the discussion of Chaucer's relation to his source, the technical handling of the text, the healthy emphasis on Chaucer as a narrative rather than a "dramatic" poet, and the attention given to those pitfalls of translation due to the deceptive similarity between fourteenth-century word-meanings and modern usage.

Duke University.

PAULL F. BAUM.

Songs from the British Drama. Edited by EDWARD BLISS REED.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925. 386 pp. \$4.00.

Professor Reed's volume is a scholarly anthology; from this fact spring both its virtues and defects. It offers more than we have a right to expect from an anthology at the same time that it gives us less than we hope for from a comprehensive study. The error, if there be one, lies in the plan of the book. After a fairly inclusive

selection from the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists, the space allotted to individual authors sensibly diminishes. The quality of the songs diminishes also, but surely room might have been found for more than one of Congreve's polished lyrics. A graver lack appears in the material following Sheridan: only 15 pages out of the total 254 are devoted to drama from 1780 to the present day, and a selection which omits *Manfred* and *The Cenci* is hardly representative. Would it not have been better to have concluded the volume at an earlier date and given a more complete view of the authors represented?

The possible chronological limits might have been difficult to fix, because of the arrangement adopted by Professor Reed. His method of listing the poems in accordance with the date of the author's birth results in such a misleading order as Tennyson, Browning, Gilbert and in including Sir Walter Raleigh's song, "Now what is love I pray thee tell," sixty pages before the work of Thomas Heywood, in whose play it occurs. A clearer and no less logical order would have been to regard the date of each author's earliest contribution to drama rather than the year of his birth.

The arrangement and selection of material is not of importance, if one considers the volume as a personal anthology instead of as an attempt to survey the field of British drama. It is in the latter capacity, however, that Professor Reed's work is of most significance. He has unearthed a number of unfamiliar lyrics, especially from masques and entertainments, which deserve to be better known. His notes are reliable and give exactly the information that is most useful and illuminating. His essay on "Some Aspects of Song in Drama" raises some interesting questions and suggests intelligent answers to them. Altogether his book is the best contribution yet made to the provocative problem of the use of songs in English dramatic literature.

HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY.

University of Buffalo.

The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library. Edited by
R. H. HILL. Printed for the Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1926.
Pp. xv + 48.

Within the covers of this slight but highly important contribution to Shelley literature, prepared under the thoroughly capable editorship of Mr. R. H. Hill, of the Bodleian Library staff, are published completely, for the first time, all but five of the unpublished letters and portions of letters of Shelley, Mary, Godwin, and others of the Shelley circle, given to the Bodleian in 1892 by Jane,

Lady Shelley. Under the conditions of her bequest, these were not to be published until July 8, 1922, the centenary of Shelley's death. The present publication is the result of the combined labors of The Merton Professor of English Literature (Professor George Stuart Gordon), Professor H. F. B. Brett-Smith, and Mr. Hill, all of whom examined the original holographs and in the case of those which had been previously published, compared them with the published versions, and noted all differences.

Probably the most important letter in the series is that on the subject of Richard Carlile's trial, which Shelley wrote to Leigh Hunt, November 3, 1819. Only the first and third sheets of this letter of five sheets had been previously published. This essay on the freedom of the press is one of a series by Shelley on this topic, the earliest being the *Letter to Lord Ellenborough*, 1812, the next, the *Refutation of Deism*, 1814, and the lately-discovered "Letters to the Friends of Freedom and Philanthropy" in *Hone's Reformer's Register*, June 14, 1817 and August 9, 1817, possibly two sequels, from the same hand.

It is regrettable that the contents of five letters which Shelley wrote to Byron, and of which transcripts in Lady Dorchester's hand are to be found in the Bodleian Mss., could not also be published. In 1882, when Sir Percy and Lady Jane Shelley issued the texts of many of the Shelley letters then in their possession, in a limited edition entitled "Shelley and Mary," Lady Dorchester, because of the Claire Clairmont-Allegria Byron material in those letters, demanded the withdrawal of the book from circulation under a threat that she would not speak to Lady Shelley again. With that threat she sent Lady Shelley transcripts of some letters written by Shelley to Byron, letters then in her possession. To the contents of one of the letters then in her hands (but whether this was one of the five in the Bodleian collection I cannot say) I have referred in *Shelley: His Life and Work* (1927).

In addition to the texts of the letters, which Mr. Hill publishes for the first time or in a corrected, complete form for the first time, he has furnished a concise and admirable preface, and an extremely useful census of the entire series of 229 letters in the Collection, recording their original publication, whether it was complete, correct, etc. All of the amended texts, and all of the new letters, have, since the appearance of Mr. Hill's book, been included in the new ten-volume Julian edition of Shelley's *Complete Works* (Correspondence, vols. VIII, IX, X) published in the United States by Charles Scribner's Sons.

WALTER EDWIN PECK.

Hunter College of the City of New York.

Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third, Being an Historical Introduction to a Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Oxford University Press, 1925. \$5.50.

This well-printed, interesting volume is in some ways a curious work. Of three hundred or more pages nearly a third are devoted to an index excessively full. The numerous footnotes, given with severe restraint, are mostly no more than numerals and letters: "P." turns out to be the *Diary* of Pepys, "P. L." is for Gairdner's edition of the *Paston Letters*, "L." is for W. S. Lindsay's *History of Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce* (London, 1874), "W." represents Jan de Vries, *De Wikingen in de Lage Landen bij de Zee* (Haarlem, 1923), and "te W." is for J. te Winkel's *De Ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Haarlem, 1908). Very erudite readers may not be obliged to refer frequently to the list of abbreviations prefixed, but from the annotations all possible color and beauty has been taken. On the other hand, in some instances excellence of the critical apparatus turns out to be apparent rather than real, for the author, although he uses the Skeat edition of *Piers the Plowman*, cites a less good edition of Chaucer, and uses the Everyman's Library reprint of Stow's *Survey of London*, and the statement "Holland was 'then [third century] holden by certaine Franks'" is based solely on a seventeenth-century edition of Stow's *Annales or Generall Chronicle of England*.

Dr. Bense has undertaken the large task of compiling a *Dictionary of Low-Dutch Words in English*. What he intended to be an introductory chapter narrating the history of intercourse between England and the Netherlands grew to such dimensions as to require this separate, preliminary volume. With wealth of specific information he recounts successive waves of Dutch and Flemish immigration into England from the eleventh to the end of the seventeenth century; he describes the close trade relations, the contact between Dutch and English fishermen, the development of some industries in England by men from the Netherlands, how English and Dutch soldiers many times fought side by side, how religious refugees came from England to the Low Countries and from the Netherlands to England; and he shows how all these factors aided in causing effect of one speech upon the other, detailing the influence of Dutch literature, culture, and art upon English people and the enrichment of the English language by borrowings from the cognate tongue. The book affords additional light for the study of language growth, while historians will find in it interesting data not elsewhere assembled.

RAYMOND TURNER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau." Par Dr. EMILE PONS. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1925. (Imported by the Oxford University Press.)

Dr. Pons is already known as the author of "Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne." His present book is an elaborate, penetrating, and judicious account of Swift's formative years. Without advancing new documentary evidence or startling theories, he skillfully sorts and utilizes all the vast supply of source-materials and biographers' interpretations which have accumulated on the subject. His prolegomenous classification and appraisal (105 large pages) is a model of its kind. He thoroughly examines and discredits the "secret marriage" to Stella and the "angry visit" to Vanessa.

His narrative of Swift's life to the year 1704 supports the belief that Stella (but not Swift) was an illegitimate child of Sir William Temple; renders more justice to Temple's behavior toward Swift than is usually accorded; shows the significance of the Scotch Presbyterians at Kilroot as prototypes for Swift's portrayals of Dissenters; and builds up a sane and fairly coherent view of the satirist's personality. We are not asked to believe that Swift was a petulant highwayman or a glorified street-cleaner: the tiger's claws are not pared.

Enthusiasm, however, seems to permeate Dr. Pons when he criticizes the *Tale of a Tub*. That work exhibits, he says, "une impeccable ordonnance, en dépit des arrêts simulés, des interruptions, des digressions: tous les prétendus obstacles auront leur utilité, mais le fil des événements ne sera de leur fait ni distendu, ni rompu." Discounting these hyperboles, we can still feel that the critic has rightly appreciated the depth and governing influence of the central "clothes-philosophy." He furnishes an interesting array of sartorial metaphors and satiric allusions in English literature prior to the *Tale*.

H. M. DARGAN.

Dartmouth College.

BRIEF MENTION

A History of French Literature from the earliest times to the present. By W. A. NITZE and E. P. DARGAN. Revised edition. New York, Holt, 1927. xi + 818 pp. This edition is new in three respects. Corrections of minor points, many of them suggested by reviewers, have been made in the body of the book; pp. 720-738, dealing with literature of the twentieth century, have been

expanded to fill pp. 723-770; the bibliography has been revised and brought up to date. The book has thus been rendered more serviceable than ever to students of French literature.

H. C. L.

A Preface to Molière. By H. ASHTON. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. xi + 177 pp. Intended for advanced undergraduates, this book, profusely illustrated, gives an interesting and correct account of Molière's life, his discussion of social questions, and the manners and customs of Paris in his day.

H. C. L.

Louise Labé, sa vie et son œuvre. Par DOROTHY O'CONNOR. Paris dissertation. Abbeville, Paillart, 1926. A useful book, especially for its biographical information. While Dr. O'C. does not dispute Calvin's verdict that Louise was a *plebeia meretrix*, she fortunately does not on this account fail to treat her justly both as a woman and as a poet. She finds that Petrarch was her chief model and that she owed little to her French predecessors. One can only admire the industry with which the subject has been investigated, but one regrets that the author does not show a more thorough acquaintance with French verse of the sixteenth century, as shown by her uninformed account of the introduction of the sonnet into France (cf. Villey, *RHL.*, xxvii, 538-547, and Bullock, *MLN.*, xxxix, 475-478) and her superficial and partly incorrect discussion of her heroine's versification. The proof-reading could have been improved in several cases, but the only serious blunder I have noted is her dating Pernetti's work a century too soon on p. 44.

H. C. L.

A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800. By R. S. CRANE and F. B. KAYE, with the assistance of M. E. PRIOR. University of North Carolina Press, 1927. 205 pp. This admirable finding list (which is reprinted from *Studies in Philology*, January, 1927) includes 2426 items arranged alphabetically according to titles followed by valuable chronological and geographical indices. There is no index of editors or contributors. The most unusual feature of the work (which would be notable even without it) is that it tells in what American libraries what numbers of each periodical may be found—except for the 1445 journals that are not to be found here at all! The second edition, which is in active preparation, will furnish the same information for the chief

libraries of Great Britain and a fuller treatment of printers, editors, and the like. Since nothing is more needed for the study of the eighteenth-century than reliable bibliographies of *genres* and of minor authors, it is fortunate that a work so useful and so laborious as this should have been done by scholars of such unusual thoroughness and accuracy.

R. D. H.

Gray, Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Johnson, Goldsmith, and others, with an Introduction and Notes by J. CROFTS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Pp. xii + 176. Following the general plan of the Clarendon Series, the editor prefixes to the selections a series of critical passages arranged so as to give a brief history of Gray's reputation.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

The Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth-Century England. By MARION K. BRAGG. University of Maine Studies, Second Series, No. 6. Orono, Maine: University Press, 1926. Pp. xi + 147. This study, elaborately planned and industriously carried out, suggests certain interesting questions about the pastoral *genre* which can hardly be answered adequately within the limits of a Master's thesis. How far did the pastoral in the strict classical tradition turn into something else, and how far did it simply atrophy? Was it rejected or was it developed? Miss Bragg at times speaks of the formal eclogue as destroyed by romanticism, and at other times as evolving into romanticism. But her project required that she stay pretty close to the old rather than the new, and carried her farther and farther from the main line of development. In this connection the results—on the whole negative—of Broughton's careful study of Theocritus and Wordsworth (not mentioned in the present monograph) are significant.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

A Critical Medley: Essays, Studies, and Notes in English, French, and Comparative Literature. By ERIC PARTRIDGE. Paris: Champion, 1926. Pp. 226. Mr. Partridge gives us undistinguished discussions of various topics, which yield such conclusions as these: "Other things being equal, the morality of literature decides its ultimate value" (p. 14). "Marlowe's versification is not only wonderful in itself, but also of the greatest significance in the

evolution of our drama" (p. 18). "Vicesimus Knox has not the polish of Addison, the ease of Chesterfield, but he belongs quite definitely to his age" (p. 54). The last essay, "The Comparative Study of Literature," contains a useful survey of discussions of the comparative method.

A. D. MCKILLOP.

Pour le centenaire du romantisme, un examen de conscience. By ERNEST SEILLIÈRE (Paris: Librairie Champion, 1927. 8°. 315 pp.). On the occasion of the centenary of Romanticism, which France celebrated last year, M. Ernest Seillière has written this book to sound again a note of warning. The baron is known as a bitter adversary of Romanticism and all its works. What repels him in this movement, is not its æsthetics, but its politics. He finds that Romanticism has had a nefarious effect on international relations. His contention is that individualism, which is the very crux and kernel of Romanticism, has also produced imperialism. The spirit of egoism, which the Romantics exalted and cultivated, brought about, so he thinks, an instinct of domination in the mutual relations of nations as well as of individuals. M. Seillière never tires of warning us against the always menacing danger of Romantic imperialism. If Germany attracted his attention in particular, it is not on account of any philosophic or artistic predilection for that country, but for the reason that of all European countries, Germany, in his opinion, represents, or represented in its monarchic days, the most menacing form of this Romantic and mystic imperialism. The work of M. Seillière is always stimulating, though not always convincing.¹

M. RUDWIN.

¹For further study of this interesting and untiring author (he has already to his credit about fifty books and over a hundred articles), the reader is referred to J. M. L. Bourdeau's book, *Ernest Seillière, historien du mysticisme romantique* (Paris: Emil-Paul, 1925). The German counterpart of Baron Seillière is Schmitt-Dorotic, author of *Politische Romantik* (Leipzig).

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

APRIL, 1928

Number 4

CALOGRENANZ AND CRESTIEN'S ORIGINALITY

Few episodes in Arthurian romance are better known than the opening adventure in Crestien's *Ivain*.¹ Keus and Calogrenanz quarrel outside Arthur's chamber. When the Queen interrupts them, Calogrenanz relates how he has come to the castle of the Hospitable Host beyond the Forest of Broceliande, has met the Giant Herdsman in the glade, has encountered Esclados the Red at the storm-making spring, has been hurled over his horse's crupper, and has returned humiliated to Arthur's court. Ivain, afraid lest Arthur or Keus or Gauvains should forestall him, steals away from the court and successfully brings to a termination the adventure of the storm-making spring.

The name Calogrenanz (obl. Calogrenant) is found sometimes slightly modified, in a number of romances after *Ivain*.² Since no similar name has been found in Welsh or in Arthurian texts before Crestien, it would be natural to assume that the name was simply an invention of the French poet's. Foerster, we may be sure, would have dismissed with scorn the suggestion that we had here a traditional character or an ancient name. Yet such is the fact.

Let us examine the name. The oblique form, Calogrenant, furnishes in the last three syllables the oblique forms of the definite article and of the present participle of the verb *grenir*, *lo grenant*, meaning "the Grumbler."³ If we ask ourselves to which

¹ Crestien de Troyes, *Ivain*, ed. W. Foerster, 1887, ll. 53 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 274, note 57. H. O. Sommer, *Vulgate Version*, Index, p. 19.

³ In Godefroy the form *grenir* is given under *grogmir*, from the 14th

Arthurian character this epithet would most aptly apply, the inevitable answer would be Kay. Indeed, Raoul de Houdenc in his *Vengeance Ragundel* uses the verb in reference to him.⁴ The common Welsh form of the name is Kei. Geoffrey of Monmouth, most of whose Arthurian nomenclature has been shown to have its basis in Breton-French usage, uses Cajus. The addition of but one letter to Crestien's form would give us Cai lo Grenant, the oblique case of Cais li Grenanz. The form *grenur* was comparatively rare; Crestien himself never uses it. It seems practically certain that Crestien's source did not recognize the traditional figure of Kay under the name Calogrenant.

There are two facts that prove that Calogrenanz is playing the traditional role of Kay. In the first place, he makes his debut in Arthurian romance in the act of quarreling. Thus he addresses his opponent: "The manure-pile will always stink, and the gadflies sting, and the bees hum, and so a bore will torment and make a nuisance of himself."⁵

Now what has probably prevented the identification of Calogrenanz long ago is the fact that he is represented quarreling with Keus, another form of the name Kay. And naturally those who approach a traditional literature with the preconception that it will show the same characteristics as a sophisticated literature would recoil from the notion that Kay could be quarreling with himself under another name. Yet the phenomenon of different developments from the same name attaching themselves to persons who appear side by side or in conflict with each other has already been noted. Gareth and Gaherys, Gaheries and Gurehes have long been recognized as doublets, even though they appeared as separate characters in the same story. And Morgan le Fay and

century *Glossaire de Douai*. Prof. Blondheim kindly gives me the reference: *Grunnirre, grenur* (E. A. Escallier, *Remarques sur le patois* [Douai, 1856], p. 395). The form in *e* is rare, but Bélioul's *Tristan*, l. 3362, gives the form *greignoient*, showing that it is early.

⁴ Ed. Friedwagner, ll. 4637-8: Kex, tu as droit se tu t'eskrignes Encontre elcs et tu les gringnes. These lines are missing in the MS. of Lord Middleton (*Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, xxxix [1919], 603). There is an unpublished dissertation on Kay by G. W. Benedict (1899) in the Harvard University Library.

⁵ Ll. 116 ff.

the Dame d'Avalon, unquestionably the same figure, are found side by side as rival enchantresses.⁶

The probable cause for the situation where Kay is discovered railing at himself under the name Calogrenanz is this. In the original version where Cais li Grenanz appeared in his proper role as a quarreler, there was no Keus, but some other knight, the butt of Cais' raillery. What his name was we do not know; anyway it was forgotten, and when the identity of Calogrenanz was lost, it behoved the story-teller to furnish a name for Calogrenanz' opponent.

What name would suggest itself more quickly than Kay's? And Kay, the recognized grumbler, forced even Calogrenanz by contrast to assume a heroic character. There are other possible explanations of the appearance of Keus side by side with his double Calogrenanz. It may be that somehow there filtered down through the oral versions of the story a reminiscence of the fact that Kay was concerned in the opening scene, and his name persisted in its recognizable as well as its unrecognized form.

At any rate we can be sure of one thing. Crestien did not himself introduce the figure of Keus beside Calogrenanz. For, thanks to the researches of many scholars, particularly Professors Zenker and A. C. L. Brown,⁷ we know that the Mabinogi of *Owain* is not based on Crestien, but on a common source; and since in *Owain* we find Kynon corresponding to Calogrenanz, and Kei to Keus, the appearance of these doubles is due, not to Crestien, but to the common source of *Ivain* and *Owain*. This source, in turn, which must have presented Calogrenanz' name in a form which distinguished him from Kay and which suggested the substitution of Kynon in the Welsh, necessarily presupposes a still earlier version of the story in which the name was clearly Cais li Grenanz.

Calogrenanz, besides the fact that he appears for the first time engaged in a quarrel, affords another clearer indication that he plays the traditional role of Kay. For he is represented undertaking, with humiliating results, an adventure which later another knight (usually Gawain) carries to a triumphant conclusion. An-

⁶ L. A. Paton, *Fairy Mythology of the Arthurian Romances* (Boston, 1903), 52, note 2.

⁷ R. Zenker, *Ivainstudien* (Halle, 1921); *Romanic Review*, III (1911), 143 ff.

other of Crestien's romances, the *Charrette*, tells how Kay insists on attempting to defend Guenievre against her abductor, Meleagans, is hurled off his horse, and it remains for Lancelot to accomplish her rescue. In Hartmann's *Iwein*, there is practically the same sequence of humiliating attempt by Kay to rescue the Queen and a successful termination of the adventure, presumably by Gawain.⁸ In the *Atre Perilos*, again, Kay's vain attempt to rescue an abducted damsel is the prelude to Gawain's eventual success. In the *Mule without a Bridle* stories Kay essays the adventure, turns back in fright, and Gawain takes his place, winning castle and bride. In *Owain* itself, the humiliation of Kynon and the triumph of Owain at the storm-making spring are later reenacted at the same place in the humiliation of Kei and the triumph of Gwalchmai.⁹ In fact this treatment of Kay may properly be called an Arthurian formula.

Now is that formula an invention of Crestien's, as a superficial guesser might suggest? Obviously not. For here it exists in *Ivain* in a form which we have just demonstrated is two removes from a form where Kay recognizably played the humiliating rôle. It is, in fact, a traditional rôle, of which Crestien himself has furnished us with one clear example in the *Charrette*, as well as the disguised version in *Ivain*.

There is another proof that the Calogrenanz adventure is traditional. It will be remembered that the King has fallen asleep in his chamber, when Calogrenanz, outside the chamber door, relates the tale of his humiliating expedition, and that, as soon as Arthur awakes, the tale is retold to him; whereupon he swears three mighty oaths to undertake the adventure himself. Compare this with the opening scene in *Perlesvaus*. King Arthur has gone to sleep in his chamber, when a young squire, Chaus or Cahus outside the chamber door, dreams of a tragic expedition to St. Augustine's chapel. In the version of this episode by Johannes Glastoniensis, based, as Lister has shown, on a common source, the squire actually goes to the chapel.¹⁰ When the King awakes

⁸ J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Gawain* (London, 1897), 69.

⁹ *White Book Mabinogion*, ed. Gwenogvryn Evans (Pwllheli, 1907), 124.

¹⁰ Cf. the excellent discussion of this whole episode in J. T. Lister, *Perlesvaus*, *Hatton MS.* (Menasha, 1921), 14-24.

at Chaus' outcry, the dream is told him, whereupon he sets forth himself to undertake the adventure. How question that we have here the same fundamental story? How question that Chaus is Kay? How question the fact that both Crestien and the author of *Perlesvaus* draw on an ultimate common source, for the latter was using a form in which the unlucky adventurer was called, not Calogrenanz, but Caus.

The Chaus adventure, again, is clearly related to another adventure of Kay's. Chaus in his dream rides away from the sleeping Arthur to a chapel, steals a golden candlestick, is met on his return by a black ugly giant, who, after remonstrating, strikes Chaus in the side with a knife. Chaus wakes to find himself once more outside Arthur's door, but mortally wounded. Compare this with the story of Kay and the Spit in Pseudo-Wauchier.¹¹ Kay, leaving Arthur and his knights resting beside a spring, rides off on a foraging expedition. He comes to a tower, finds within a dwarf roasting a peacock on a spit, demands it, and when it is refused, kicks him against the pillar. Thereupon a tall knight enters and strikes Kay violently with the spit to the earth, so that he rides back empty-handed to Arthur. Manifestly the tale of Chaus in *Perlesvaus* is a fusion of stories represented by the Calogrenanz episode in *Ivain* and by Kay and the Spit in Pseudo-Wauchier.¹²

¹¹ C. Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois* (Mons, 1866), III, 239-48. A version of the incident based on Pseudo-Wauchier is contained in the Middle English *Golagros and Gawane* (F. Madden, *Sir Gawayne*, London, 1839, 132-5).

¹² Lister, *loc. cit.*, shows that the Chaus episode is also related to the incident in the *Huth Merlin*, where Arthur lies down in a pavilion to sleep, hears a knight lamenting, sends Balaaïn (whom I have shown to be Gawain under a corrupt name) to fetch him, the mourning knight is slain by an invisible rider, Balaaïn then undertakes the slain knight's adventure and rides forth to accomplish it. Lister also introduces the parallel from Pseudo-Wauchier, where a knight passes before the Queen's pavilion, overthrows Kay when he summons him, but returns at the request of Gawain, is slain by a spear as they approach the tents, Gawain undertakes his quest, goes to a chapel with a golden candlestick, and hears a horrible voice. We are justified in assuming a fundamental tradition under all these stories involving the following points: Arthur is sleeping; Kay comes back from an adventure in which he has been humiliated or mortally wounded; Arthur or Gawain sets out in his stead and achieves the adventure.

It is equally certain, however, that the author of *Perlesvaus* did not use precisely the versions found in these two surviving literary forms. The traditions came to him through other channels. The Calogrenanz episode throws some light on what these channels were. In this respect it supports Foerster's view that the immediate source of such traditional material as Crestien used was Brittany. The localization in the Forest of Broceliande certainly points in this direction. In this it corroborates much other evidence, including the fact that another corrupt name-form which Crestien employs in *Erec*, Graislemeiers de Fineposterne, has long been recognized as based on that of the historic Gradlon Mor, King of Cornouaille in Finisterre.¹³ Indeed the facts overwhelmingly substantiate the view that the French and Anglo-Norman romancers derived their material from French-speaking Breton *conteurs*.

But Foerster was wrong in believing that this material was invented by the Bretons, for much of it can be traced back to Wales or Ireland. And it is significant in this connection to note that the Chantilly MS. gives the name Calogrenanz in the corrupt form Galos grenans.¹⁴ The reason for this is obvious. The Bretons knew that much of the material came to them from Wales; localizations in Carlyon, Glamorgan, Destregales or Sugales, Norgales, etc. were familiar; and at least one hero was famous as Perceval li Galois. There was, therefore, a natural tendency for other names to develop associations with Wales. The hero of a German romance, Wigalois, must derive his name from his French counterpart Guiglai(n)s, and the deformation of the latter part must be due to a fancied detection of the word *galois*, "Welsh."¹⁵ The feminine form *galesche* has influenced the name Galeschin, which is applied to a hero in the Dolorous Tower episode corresponding to Galvariun on the Modena sculpture.¹⁶

It is from Wales, of course, that the figure of Kay himself comes. Here again, the evidence tallies with the many indications we possess that at least the nucleus of Arthurian romance took

¹³ *ZfSL*, XII (1891), 1.

¹⁴ *Yvain*, ed. Foerster, 1887, p. 3, note 1. 57.

¹⁵ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance* (New York, 1927), 319.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 63.

shape in Wales and Dumnonia. And what we learn from *Kilhwch and Olwen* about Kei corroborates the abundant signs of the mythical nature of this nucleus. Whoever Kei may have been originally, man or god, he certainly possesses mythological attributes in the famous description in the *Mabinogi*.¹⁷ "Kei had a certain power. His breath lasted nine nights and nine days under water. Nine nights and nine days he would go without sleep. The stroke of Kei's sword no leech could heal. Victorious was Kei. As high as the tallest tree of the forest he would be when he pleased. Another trait he had: when the rain was heaviest, whatever was in his hand, a handbreadth above his hand and a handbreadth below, would be dry by reason of his heat. And when his companions were coldest, that would serve as kindling for them to light the fire."

Anyone familiar with the vestiges of myth in Irish saga will find points of comparison here. Kei's sword, which dealt wounds no leech could heal, may be of the same nature as the Sword of Nuada, presumably the lightning. "When it was drawn from its deadly sheath no one ever escaped from it, and it was irresistible."¹⁸ Kei's height brings him into relation with the gigantic Curoi and the Dagda, two divine figures. But certainly the most significant feature is Kei's heat, which Zimmer long since pointed out as a parallel to Cuchulinn's fiery nature.¹⁹ When the latter sat down during cold weather with the snow reaching to his girdle, and cast off his clothes, the heat of his body would melt the snow for a man's cubit around him.²⁰ To my mind these caloric traits of Kei and Cuchulinn are faint traces of the original incandescence of the anthropomorphized sun. As for Cuchulinn, there is abundant evidence that, whether originally god or man, he inherits from his father Lug his solar nature, and plays in certain stories a mythical role.²¹ An ancient poem in the *Black Book of Carmarthen* represents Kei in the company of Llwh Llawynnawc, who is no other than Lug under a corrupt name;²² of Mabon the

¹⁷ *White Book Mabinogion*, ed. G. Evans, col. 470 f.

¹⁸ *Revue Celtique*, XII, 57 f.

¹⁹ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1890, 517.

²⁰ J. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures* (London, 1892), 440.

²¹ Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, 47 ff.

²² *Ibid.*, 92 f.

son of Modron, who is descended from the Romano-British Apollo Maponos;²³ of Manawydan son of Llyr, who is undoubtedly a Welsh god.²⁴ When we read also that "unless it should be God's act, Kei's death would be unachieved,"²⁵ we may feel pretty sure that the reservation is simply a Christian addendum to the belief that Kei was immortal. Kei possesses the earmarks of divinity.

The *Black Book* poem represents him as the greatest of Arthur's warriors; other Welsh literature, unaffected by Continental traditions, always treats him respectfully, though there is a hint of his churlishness in *Kilhwch*.²⁶ It was among the Bretons apparently that the habit grew up of using him as a foil for another hero, Gawain, who also had a divine origin. Gawain had as his prototype the Irish Cuchulinn, and it was an Irish formula that two Irish heroes, Conall Cernach and Loegaire, should inevitably fail in one exploit after another, only that Cuchulinn might demonstrate his divine superiority. Just as Gawain inherited the triumphant rôle of Cuchulinn, Kei unluckily fell heir to the humiliating part of Conall and Loegaire.

The proofs accumulate that Crestien did not invent the plots of his romances, with the exception of *Cligès*, but took them ready-made. Since, with the same exception, they abound in unexplained allusions, inconsistencies, and doublets, it must heighten our estimate of him to relieve him of responsibility for these blemishes. Moreover, his express repudiation of credit for the *matière* of the *Charrette*, and his abandonment of the most incoherent and rambling of his poems are, on this interpretation, not only comprehensible but also commendable. They are just what we should expect from a Frenchman with an artistic conscience, compelled to make poetry out of picturesque but incoherent *contes*.

ROGER S. LOOMIS.

Columbia University.

²³ *Ibid.*, 193, 353.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 182-6.

²⁵ Malory, *Morte d'Arthur*, Everyman ed., I, 20.

²⁶ *White Book Mabinogion*, col. 229.

JANUS CORNARIUS'S *SELECTA EPIGRAMMATA*
GRAECA AND THE EARLY ENGLISH
 EPIGRAMMATISTS

Professor T. K. Whipple, in his intelligent and learned study of *Martial and the English Epigram from Sir Thomas Wyatt to Ben Jonson*,¹ incidentally traces a number of the English epigrams of the period to their source in the Greek Anthology. The present paper, drawn from my notes toward a book on the English translations from the classics during the sixteenth century, is intended to supplement his work in this field down to the publication of Timothy Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes*.

As Professor Whipple points out, the tradition of the Anthology first makes an impression on English literature in the verse of Grimald; and to his verse that tradition came not from the classics but from the neo-classics,—from contemporary writers of Latin verse. This observation of Professor Whipple's is the more acute since Professor Hudson's notable paper² exhibiting the debt of Grimald to Beza had evidently not appeared when his manuscript was prepared for publication. Professor Whipple calls attention to the fact that *Mans life after Posidonius* (*sic* in Tottel; it should be Posidippus) or Crates, and the companion piece, Metrodorus *minde to the contrarie*, Tottel, p. 109, come from Pal. Anth. ix, 359, 360, through Erasmus. In addition, of *M. T. Cicero* (Tottel, p. 125; Beza, Icones) is based on Pal. Anth. vii, 237. The list of the Muses (Tottel, p. 100) comes from [pseudo-] Ausonius lib. xxii, ep. 3, which is modified from Anth. Pal. ix, 504; Cleobulus *the Lydians riddle* (Tottel, p. 102) is Anth. Pal. xiv, 101. Of the *Description of virtue* (Tottel, p. 108; Beza, Epigram xxxi) Professor Padelford says: "I cannot discover a source for these particular symbols, though, of course, the symbolical representation of the virtues and vices was very common in the Middle Ages. Cf. the descriptions in the Romaunt of the Rose."³ The particular symbols may have originated with Beza, but the idea of this form of symbolism is classical, and originated with epigrams on statues. The epigram may have been imitated, as Professor Courthope sug-

¹ Berkeley, California, 1925.

² *M. L. N.*, xxxix, 388.

³ *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics* (1907), 145.

gests,⁴ from Ausonius lib. xix, ep. 33, but this epigram is itself an imitation of Anth. Plan. iv, 275. Indeed, the epigram of Beza is nearer to the Greek epigram with its moral reflexion at the end than to the epigram of Ausonius.

Professor Whipple follows twenty-eight of the epigrams in Turberville's *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonnets* ultimately back to the Anthology,⁵—sixteen, as he believes, through Sir Thomas More's Latin, six through Ausonius, and six through some medium which he had not discovered. There are some five translations or close imitations besides three somewhat more distant imitations to be added to the list; and the intermediary of all of them seems to me to be probably *Selecta Epigrammata Graeca Latine versa, ex septem Epigrammatum Graecorum libris*, Basileae, 1529.⁶ The book was a compilation made by Janus Cornarius. The Greek text of the selected epigrams is accompanied in each case with one or more Latin versions by the scholars of the day, the names of the translators being given. In addition, there are some fairly free imitations included. All the epigrams in Turberville which Mr. Whipple and I have traced to the Anthology, including the versions of More and Ausonius, are in Cornarius. Indeed, Turberville might have taken his choice of versions in most cases. The following table, which includes Mr. Whipple's data and his lettering to identify the epigrams, supplements the information given by him (my additions in square brackets):

Turberville	More	Anth. Pal.	Sel. Ep.
a) p. 110: Whilst fissher kest:	p. 285	IX 442	[p. 124]
b) p. 128: Asclepiad, that greedie:	p. 265	XI 391	[p. 236]
c) p. 132: By hap a man:	p. 286	XI 251	[p. 191]
d) p. 147: O man of little wit:	p. 283	IX 376	[p. 99]
p. 148: A vassell to the winde:	[Sleidanus?]	[IX 31]	[p. 98]
e) p. 148: Leave off, good Beroe:	p. 287	XI 408	[p. 157]
f) p. 149: Stande with thy nose:	p. 339	XI 418	[p. 166]
g) p. 119: O Proclus! tis in vaine:	p. 299	XI 268	[p. 165]
h) p. 151: At night, when ale:	p. 340	[XI 46]	[p. 219]
Men having quafft:	p. 340	[XI 46]	[p. 219]
i) p. 152: To drawe the minde:	p. 307	XI 412	[p. 216]

⁴ *History of English Poetry*, II, 150.

⁵ P. 315.

⁶ In the British Museum; the library of the University of Wisconsin now has a rotograph.

Turberville	More	Anth. Pal.	Sel. Ep.
j) p. 189: The sonne in lawe:	p. 341	IX 67	[p. 92-93]
p. 189: Gladde was the sonne:	p. 341	IX 67	[p. 92-93]
k) p. 213: Not he so muche:	p. 268	X 121	[p. 86-87]
p. 214: Of both give mee:	p. 268	X 121	[p. 86-87]
l) p. 214: A misers minde:	p. 266	XI 294	[p. 233]
Ausonius			
m) p. 110: Marche felt himselfe:	XIX 80	XI 114	[p. 176]
n) p. 151: This Rufe his table:	XIX 9	XI 151	[p. 216]
o) p. 176: In complete (armour) Pallas:	XIX 64	XVI 174	[p. 349]
p) p. 177: Thou witles wight:	XIX 32	[Placed in Sel. Ep. under Plan. IV 155]	
q) p. 177: The scenting hounds:	XIX 35	IX 17, 18	[p. 68]
r) p. 241: A man in deepe dispaire:	XIX 14	IX 44	[p. 131]
s) p. 123: The poet Homer:	[Guarino]	XVI 296	[p. 384]
t) p. 150: Thou sielie foole:	[Marullus]	IX 346	[p. 139]
What (Philomela) meanes:	[Marullus]	IX 346	[p. 139]
u) p. 176: I, Dido, and the queene:	[credited to Ausonius]	IV 151	[p. 339]
v) p. 195: A Thracyan boy:	[C. Germanicus Aug.]	VII 542	[p. 47]
w) p. 199: My girle, thou gazest:	[Guarino]	VII 669	[p. 261]
p. 121: What! yst not follie:	[More]	[X 69]	[p. 71-72]
p. 129: A schollar skilide:	[credited to Ausonius]	[IX 168]	[p. 39]
p. 150: An aged trot:	[Varii]	[XI 70]	[p. 155]
p. 152: In death you part:	[A conceit based on a a line in Ausonius]	[VII 396]	[p. 277]
p. 187: What time the ladie:	[Politian]	[IX 440]	[p. 55]

The last of these epigrams is the *Runaway Cupid* of Moschus, which had somehow got into the Anthology, and in the translation of which elegant scholars at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century engaged in a veritable tournament.

The following epigrams are directly imitated from the Anthology:

Turberville		Anthology	Sel. Ep.
p. 159: Good reason thou	[Luscinus]	Pal. XI 426	p. 198
p. 205:	[Io. Sleidanus]	Pal. X 60	p. 107
p. 214: Thou (painter fond)	[B. Dardanus]	Plan. IV 275	p. 375

Timothy Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes* has been the subject of severe reprobation by Professor Hyder A. Rollins because of the free use of Turberville's labors made in it without acknowledgment. His words are: "Kendall's plagiarisms are almost unbelievably impudent," and he seems to suggest that Kendall falsified by

attributing epigrams really by Turberville to classic sources;—"Epigrams said by Kendall to be translated from Ausonius . . . Epigrams said by Kendall to be translated 'out of Greek'." ⁷ This severity would have surprised both Kendall and Turberville. The word *Flowers* in the title means *the pick, selected examples, elegant extracts*. The *Anthology* itself is *Florilegium*, a collection of flowers plucked in the garden of poetry. The word was common in this sense. There were *Flores legum*, often printed in the sixteenth century; *Flores Erasmi*, *Flores Terentii*. Even in the nineteenth century *Flowers of Fable* and *Flowers of Piety* were published. Kendall's title, therefore (*Flowers of Epigrammes, out of sundrie the most singular authors, as well auncient as late writers*) means *The Best Epigrams selected from Ancient and Modern Writers*. And as is well known the rights of literary property had not been established in his day; and even on principles of decorum as then understood there was no obligation upon him to print his author's name in his anthology. He draws epigrams among others from Surrey, Grimald, and Sir Thomas Elyot, without acknowledgement; the editor of the edition published by the Spenser Society is quite wrong in saying that the epigrams are the work of one man. They never pretended to be; and probably if Kendall could be traced to all his sources it would be found that his collection is mainly the work of other writers.⁸

In comparing Kendall's epigrams with the printed forms of his sources we find remarkable variations. The English names in Grimald's epigrams are replaced by the names which were in the epigrams of Beza which Grimald translated, and several of Turberville's epigrams appear in a form nearer to their originals than that in the printed book. Did Kendall mainly edit these poems, restoring them to their sources, or did he have manuscripts before him differing from the printed texts? In the case of Grimald it would seem that the latter is the case, for if he had known Tottel's Miscellany, it is almost certain, as Mr. Crawford suggests, that he would have used it more freely.

Kendall has sixty epigrams in the list headed, "Out of Greek." All but one are in Cornarius's collection; that one is *There's many*

⁷ *Modern Philology*, xv, 130 ff.

⁸ *Englands Parnassus*, compiled by Robert Allot (1600), ed. Charles Crawford (Oxford, 1913), 484 n.

a slip twist the cup and the lip (Anth. Pal. x. 32). It might have come from Erasmus's Adagia, where it is the first adage of the fifth century of the first chiliad. All the epigrams but three, moreover, are in the same order in which they appear in Cornarius. Timon's epitaph is obviously placed at the end for rhetorical effect, and of the other two one is only slightly out of order and the other is associated in sentiment with its neighbors. Besides, it is to be noted that the first epigram in the *Flowers* is *Out of Pulix an auncient Poet*, and the first epigram in *Selecta Epigrammata Graeca* is headed *Pulicis poetae antiqui*. Kendall, it would seem, worked directly from Cornarius's collection; and since he apparently had it before him, he might easily have altered Turberville's poems slightly to introduce the original proper names, or in other respects to bring the epigrams nearer to their originals. The following table exhibits the relation of Kendall's epigrams "out of Greek" to the *Selecta Epigrammata* and the Anthology. The order is that in Kendall.

	Sel. Ep.	Anthology
Vse riches those thou hast:	p. 17	Pal. X 26
Greate stoore of houses:	p. 18	" X 119
I wepte when I was borne:	p. 30	" X 84
His first wife dedde:	p. 34	" IX 133
Virginitie surpasseseth:	p. 34	" IX 444
A Thracian boye:	p. 47	" VII 542
A Fisher fishyng:	p. 62	" IX 52
Where shouldst thou:	p. 66	" IX 126
Betwene thy vpper lip:	from Erasmus	" X 32
Whoso he:	p. 75	" X 112
Three thynges both hurte:	p. 75	" X 112
Those Caitiffe:	p. 75	" X 27
Not he so mucche:	p. 85	" X 36
To mucche of anythyng:	p. 91	Plan. I 16
To decke his stepdames:	p. 92	Pal. IX 67
My resting rode:	p. 122	" IX 49
While Fisher fisht:	p. 124	" IX 442
While Fisher cast:	p. 124	" IX 442
The Cittyes 7:	p. 135	" IX 127
Solace and Comfort:	p. 140	" IX 50
Solace and Comfort: (otherwise)	p. 140	" IX 50
The frisking flees:	p. 145	" XI 432
While Thales:	p. 150	" XI 349
Although all women kinde:	p. 160	" XI 381
When Castor diggs:	p. 161	" XI 203

	Sel. Ep.	Anthology
The wrecche that married hath:	p. 165	Pal. XI 287
Stand with thy snoute:	p. 166	" XI 418
By hap a man:	p. 190	" XI 251
Marcus a sluggard:	p. 199	" XI 277
To paint the minde:	p. 209	" XI 412
With sweet perfumes:	p. 216	" XI 8
Like men we still:	p. 219	" XI 46
At night when ale:	p. 219	" XI 46
Men hauning quaft:	p. 219	" XI 46
All call thee riche:	p. 230	" XI 166
Riche Chrisalus:	p. 233	" XI 170
A misers mynde:	p. 233	" XI 294
Riche Aulus:	p. 238	" XI 172
Avlus daughter:	p. 238	" XI 172
Asclepiad that gredie carle:	p. 236	" XI 391
If so a long:	p. 241	" XI 430
Thy lymys:	p. 243	" XI 273
Sith that a mortall:	p. 247	" VII 327
Timocritus a warrior:	p. 250	" VII 250
Thou messenger:	p. 250	" VII 161
The frounyng fates:	p. 269	" IX 308
Eche one doth seke:	p. 37	" IX 54
Here buried lies:	p. 285	" VII 265
It makes no matter:	p. 286	" VII 288
Shunne thou the seas:	p. 288	" VII 668
A Sachell and:	p. 300	" VII 68
Great force in thynges:	p. 300	" VII 126
My name did Epictetus:	p. 313	" VII 676
A painter:	p. 316	Plan. IV 32
The cove of brasse:	p. 323	Pal. IX 727
King Priams sonne:	p. 346	Plan. IV 168
Why hast thou:	p. 348	Plan. IV 171
Vnto the nimphes:	p. 393	Pal. VI 26
Biton all vnderneath:	p. 394	" VI 158
A sire that:	p. 396	" VI 331
My wretched caitiff dayes:	p. 266	" VII 313

The monk Planudes, whose edition of the Anthology was of course the only one known to the sixteenth century, had a fatal propensity toward the later and poorer epigrams; his translators chose out of his selections the most grotesque and the most heavily moralizing; and the translators of the translators usually failed to reproduce the skilful rhetorical turn of the ideas shown in

their Latin masters. Even so, the work through which English men of letters first became effectively acquainted with the Anthology seems to me not without importance.

H. B. LATHROP.

University of Wisconsin.

THE PARSON'S TALE: A MEDIAEVAL SERMON

In his surprising retraction at the close of the *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer begs forgiveness for his 'endytynge of worldly vanitees . . . But of the translacion of Boece de Consolacione, and othere bokes of Legendes of seintes, and omelies, and moralitee, and devocioun, that thanke I oure lord Iesu Crist and his blisful moder, and alle the seintes of hevene.' Among the homilies here mentioned I intend to show that the *Parson's Tale* may justly be numbered, because of its strict accordance with the principles of mediaeval sermon writing. I shall analyze it in the light of Professor Caplan's translation of a mediaeval tract on preaching,¹ and of G. R. Owst's *Preaching in Medieval England* (1926).

The tract describes an ideal sermon as follows:

First the preacher should pronounce his theme in Latin in a low voice, then introduce one prayer in the vulgar tongue. . . . Now he should resume his theme, using the vulgar tongue for expression. And after this he can draw or elicit one prelocution [to explain the text] through similes, moralizations, proverbs, or natural truths, or sometimes even by adducing definite authorities. Another name for the prelocution is the protheme, because it is expressed before the division of the theme and the main substance of the sermon. . . . When the prelocution has been premised, resume the theme and its division. . . . Next comes the treatment of the members in order: first, the first main part of the theme with its divisions; next, the second main part of the theme with its divisions; and so with the thurd. And when all the members, main and subordinate, have been discussed, the preacher can make a practical recapitulation of his sermon, so that if they have neglected the beginning, the people may know on what the sermon and its conclusions are based.²

¹ "A Late Medieval Tractate on Preaching," translated by Harry Caplan, in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans*, New York, 1926. For an application of this translation to the *Pardoner's Tale* see my article in *MLN.*, xli (1926), 506-9.

² Pp. 89-90. Of the theme, or text, the tract says further (p. 74):

The *Parson's Tale* closely follows this outline. It begins with a short theme from the Bible, pronounced in Latin: *State super vias et videte et interrogate de viis antiquis, que sit via bona; et ambulate in ea, et inuenietis refrigerium animabus vestris.* Jer. 6. 16.³

Between the theme and the main substance of the sermon comes the prelocution, or protheme, for the proof of the term or terms of the theme.⁴ The term here, according to the anagogical interpretation of the text, is 'Penitence,' which the Parson has already called 'a ful noble wey and a ful convenable' to lead folk to our Lord Jesus Christ. In proof or as definition of the term he adduces the words of St. Ambrose that 'Penitence is the pleyninge of man for the gilt that he hath doon, and na-more to do any thing for which him oghte to pleyne,' and adds passages from 'som doctour,' from 'Seint Isidre,' and from 'Seint Gregorie.'

The prelocution finished, the next step is the division of the theme, Penitence, into three parts like the parts of a tree: 'The rote of this tree is Contricion, that hydeth him in the herte of him that is verray repentant, right as the rote of a tree hydeth him in the erthe. Of the rote of Contricion springeth a stalke, that bereth braunches and leues of Confession, and fruit of Satisfaccion.' This figure of the tree appears also in the tract, which says (p. 88):

Then the prelocution or protheme grows into the principal divisions of the theme as the trunk into the main branches. And the principal branches should, beyond, multiply into secondary divisions, that is, subdivisions and subdistinctions. . . . Its theme is divided into three parts;

'The theme is the begining of the sermon. In regard to it there are many considerations: first, that it is taken from the Bible; that it has a clearly perceived meaning—not incongruous; that it is not too long nor too short; that it is expressed in terms well suited to preaching.'

³ Rev. Adam Clarke (1762?-1832), in his note on this verse, says, 'There is an excellent sermon on these words in the works of our first poet, *Geoffrey Chaucer*. . . . The text, I find, was read by him as it appears in my old MS. Bible:—Standith upon weies and seeth, and asketh of the olde pathes; What is the good weie; and goth in it, and yee schul fynden refresching to your soulis.' This reading agrees with the earlier Wyclifite version printed by Forshall and Madden. The note is in *The Holy Bible with Commentary and Critical Notes*, reprinted, New York, 1850, iv, p. 273.

⁴ Caplan, p. 74.

each part is divided into three members; each member can be amplified by several of the nine methods above described.⁵

The Parson's figure of a tree introduces the rest of his sermon, which develops each of the three parts, Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction, by division of each into its respective members. The four members of Contrition are: the four things in Contrition or Penance; the six causes that move to Contrition; the six manners of Contrition; what Contrition avails to the soul. The members of Confession are four: the three sources whence sins spring; the two manners of sins, the venial sins and how man may restrain himself from them, and the seven deadly sins with their remedies; the seven circumstances that aggravate sin; the condition of good Confession. Of Satisfaction there are three members: the three manners of alms; bodily pains; the four things that disturb penance.

At the end of the three main parts of the sermon, the Parson gives a brief recapitulation: 'Thanne shal men understonde what is the fruit of penaunce; and, after the word of Iesu Crist, it is the endeles blisse of hevene. . . . This blisful regne may men purchase by poverte espirituel, and the glorie by lowenesse; the plentee of Ioye by hunger and thirst, and the reste by travaille; and the lyf by deeth and mortificacion of sinne.' This completes the outline of the Parson's sermon.

For my purpose it is unnecessary to discuss the 'amplification' of the sermon by certain of the nine methods found on pages 76-84 of the tract. Of these Chaucer most commonly employs the agreement of authorities, such as the Bible, the Church Fathers, and moral philosophers.

In the second part, on Confession, occurs the discussion of the seven deadly sins and their remedies, which demands special attention. This discussion has usually been regarded as something quite apart from the rest of the sermon; and the whole tale has even been called by Professor Liddell 'a clumsy combination of

⁵ Cf. Owst, pp. 321-2: 'When the sermon is based upon an ordinary text of Scripture, the task of extracting three convenient ideas, upon which to hang the rest of the discourse does not appear very difficult. For three, with that characteristic mediaeval love of symbolic numbers perhaps, is regular choice for the main *divisio*.'

two religious treatises.' Granting, as we must, that two treatises have been combined,⁶ is there still no evidence upon which the unity of the entire homily can be established? I believe that there is, and shall begin with that in the second part of the sermon. At the very beginning of this division the Parson, having defined Confession as the 'verray shewing of sinnes to the preest,' says, 'And forther over, it is necessarie to understonde whennes that sinnes springen, and how they encresen, and whiche they been'; and adds later, 'For sothe, sinne is in two maneres; outhur it is venial, or deedly sinne,' and so passes by logical steps to a discussion of each one in turn, giving far greater importance to the deadly sins.

External evidence in favor of the unity of the sermon is found in the doctrine of confession held in the late Middle Ages: namely, that the deadly, or mortal sins, must be confessed, but that the venial sins need no confession. This is set forth by Thomas Aquinas, whom Harnack (*Hist. Dog.* VI, 251) calls 'the theologian on confession before the priest.' In *Summa*, Penance III, Suppl., Quest. 8, Art. 3, he writes:

By venial sin man is separated neither from God nor from the sacraments of the Church: wherefore he does not need to receive any further grace for the forgiveness of such a sin, nor does he need to be reconciled to the Church. 'Consequently a man does not need to confess his venial sins to a priest.

Confession of mortal, or deadly sins, however, is doubly enjoined. On this Thomas is clear in *Summa*, Pen. III, Suppl., Quest. 6, Art. 3:

We are bound to confession on two counts: first, by the Divine law, from the very fact that confession is a remedy, and in this way not all are bound to confession, but those only who fall into mortal sin after Baptism; secondly, by a precept of positive law, and in this way all are bound by the precept of the Church laid down in the general council (Later. iv.. *Can.* 21) under Innocent III.

In this distinction between the venial and the deadly sins lies the secret of the Parson's long dissertation on the seven deadly

⁶ See *The Sources of the Parson's Tale*, by Kate O. Petersen, Radcliffe College Monograph 12, Boston, 1901.

sins. He and Thomas are in substantial agreement regarding the remission of the venial sins by good works:

Men may also refreyne venial sinne [he tells us] by receyvinge worthily of the precious body of Iesu Crist; by receyving eek of holy water; by almesdede; by general confession of *Confiteor* at masse and at complin; and by blessinge of bishopes and of preestes, and by othere gode werkes.⁷

The deadly sins, however, are not so easily forgiven, but demand confession to the priest before absolution can be pronounced. Hence it is that the good Parson, finding in the company of pilgrims so many persons sorely in need of repentance, introduces his long and eloquent discussion of the deadly sins that require 'verray shewinge . . . to the preest.'

If the discussion of the sins seems out of proportion to the rest of the sermon, it is only necessary to recall the fondness of the mediaeval preachers for this ever-recurring subject. Owst writes (p. 322):

Once let the mediaeval homilist get astride the vices, and then the virtues which ever accompany them, and he may be safely trusted to gallop triumphantly to his conclusion. What a vista of separate crimes, follies, excuses, pains, and penalties, they open up to Dr. Bromyard, with his searching eye ever upon the contemporary scene!

In a note on this passage the writer says that this topic and the Decalogue (together with Heaven and Hell) were considered the *marrow of all preaching*, and quotes from preachers' manuals such phrases as: 'ad mores intruere, vicia reprehendere, et ad penitentiam excitare,' or ' . . . how thei schulde flee synne, and use vertu, and so shone the pyne of helle, and come to the blisse of hevene.'

How Dr. Bromyard would have rejoiced to hear the Parson's recital of the vices that are twigs of the deadly sin of Pride:

Ther is Inobedience, Avauntinge, Ipocrisie. Despyt, Arrogance, Impudence, Swellinge of herte, Insolence, Elacion, Impacience, Strif, Contumacie, Presumpcion, Irreverence, Pertinacie, Veyne Glorie; and many another twig that I can nat declare.

In this paper I have shown how the main body of the *Parson's Tale* follows the rules of sermon making, and I have sought to

⁷ Cf. *Summa*, Pen. III, Quest. 87, Art. 3.

justify the long discussion of the seven deadly sins which has hitherto been regarded as incongruous. If the presence of this discussion can be justified, the chief cause for denying that the tale is a complete sermon will be removed, and no doubt will remain but that Chaucer, when he borrowed two separate religious treatises and joined them together, knew that he was making a sermon well fitted both to the Parson and to his motley group of sinners riding toward Canterbury. In his scholarly address before the British Academy Professor Manly clearly showed Chaucer's indebtedness to the mediaeval rhetoricians and their *artes versificandi*. In this study of the *Parson's Tale*, and in my former study of the *Pardoner's Tale*, I hope that I have shown how much he likewise owed to that other great school of mediaeval rhetoric—the preachers and their *artes praedicandi*.

COOLIDGE OTIS CHAPMAN.

Williams College.

OLD ENGLISH VERSE IN CHAUCER

The splendid description of the tournament in the *Knight's Tale* stands out peculiarly from its context. The reason seems to be not merely that Chaucer is here writing in entire independence of Boccaccio, that he is basing his description of a tournament upon no literary model but directly upon personal experience¹ and that, as a result, the passage has a certain vividness and an immediacy of appeal that perhaps no other passage in the poem can boast; apart from this, there is something in the *sound* of the lines that sets them apart. If the twenty lines beginning

Now ringen trompes loude and clarioun (2600)

are read aloud, this is particularly evident.

The obvious explanation, that alliterating pairs and alliterating groups of words are used with unusual frequency, is not wholly adequate. It is, I believe, not a question of alliteration alone, but

¹ As, from another point of view, I have attempted to show elsewhere: "Elements of Realism in the Knight's Tale," *JEGP.*, xiv (1915), 226-255.

of alliteration and accent. Such lines as the following may indeed be scanned regularly:

u / u / u / u u u /
 In goon the sper(e)s ful sadly in arest (2602)
 u / u / u / u / u / u
 In goth the sharpe spore into the syde (2603)
 u / u / u / u / u / u /
 Ther shiv(e)ren shaftes upon sheeldes thikke (2605)
 u / u / u / u / u / u / u
 With mighty maces the bones they to-breste (2611)
 u / u / u / u / u / u / u
 He thurgh the thikkeste of the throng gan threste (2612)
 u / u / u / u / u / u /
 And he him hurtleth with his hors adoun (2616)

But they may be scanned also, and perhaps more naturally, according to a different and freer system of versification:

/ u u / u / u u u /
 In goon the sper(e)s ful sadly in arest
 / u u / u / / u u u / u
 In goth the sharpe spore into the syde
 u / u / u / u u / u / u
 Ther shiv(e)ren shaftes upon sheeldes thikke
 u / u / u / u / u / u / u
 With mighty maces the bones they to-breste
 u / u / u / u u / u / u /
 He thurgh the thikkeste of the throng gan threste
 u / u / u / u u / u / u
 And he him hurtleth with his hors adoun

This is, of course, equivalent to saying that each of these lines, in its treatment of alliteration as well as of the four accents, is virtually a line of Old English poetry. Line 2611, to be sure, is the exception, since the first stressed syllable of the second part of the line does not alliterate with either of the stresses of the first part; but the scheme of two independent alliterating pairs of stresses, in the two parts of the line, is an understandable variation.

One wonders whether, throughout Chaucer, the old four-beat alliterative measure does not echo more frequently than has been supposed.

u / u / u / / u u / u
 With floures fele, faire under fete (Book of Duchesse, 400)

for example, certainly suggests the scansion indicated, and the Old English system, rather than normal iambic tetrameter.

The passage from the *Knight's Tale*, however, is more interesting, in that the suggestions of four-stress alliterative verse occur in a poem in five-stress verse. Is it not significant of the other and the more neglected side of Chaucer's poetic background, that in this battle scene one may hear, surging to the surface through the alien iambic metre, the echoes of the rhythm of *Maldon* and *Brunnanburh*? Has not the poet, half consciously, left for the moment French and Italian guides behind him, to draw upon his English inheritance?

STUART ROBERTSON.

Temple University.

LES EMPLOYÉS AND SCÈNES DE LA VIE BUREAUCRATIQUE

Numerous critics have pointed out the indebtedness of Balzac's *Employés* to Henri Monnier. For instance, Jules Fleury in his interesting and richly documented biography of the author of *Scènes populaires* expresses the conviction that he was the model for Balzac's portrait of Bixiou.¹ Other scholars notice the undoubted resemblance of Phellion, a strongly individualized character of *les Employés*, to the immortal Joseph Prudhomme.² Still others discover an influence of one of Monnier's "scènes" entitled *Scènes de la vie bureaucratique; intérieurs de bureaux*, on Balzac's similar study in bureaucracy.

As the latter point has apparently never received more than casual mention,³ it is the purpose of the present paper to consider it in somewhat greater detail. Such a study should yield information regarding the attitude of Balzac toward his literary sources and his general method of working over borrowed material.

¹ *Henri Monnier, sa vie, son œuvre*, Paris, E. Dentu, 1889, pp. 85-94.

² Crépet, J., *Honoré de Balzac, pensées, sujets, fragmens*, p. 117, footnote. Gautier, Th., *Portraits contemporains*, p. 36.

³ By Sp. de Lovenjoul in *les lundis d'un chercheur* and Pierre Martino in *le roman réaliste*. I was unable to consult chapters on Monnier by Mirecourt and Dolligen and an apparently anonymous article in *Temple Bar*.

The *Scènes de la vie bureaucratique; intérieurs de bureaux* first appeared in 1835 in the edition of the *Scènes populaires* put out by Deprez-Parent at Brussels and in 1836 by Dumont at Paris. Its qualities always exercised great fascination over Balzac. Especially it was *vécu*, its author having spent several years in the very atmosphere of pompous officialdom and grovelling intrigue which it represents. Already in 1828 he had enlivened Paris by a series of pencil sketches of the *bureaux* called *Mœurs administratives*. Now he returned to the same subject, reproducing, with considerable verve, the characteristic peculiarities and, in one instance, the exact turns of expression, of his former associates at the desk.

The extent to which this study influenced Balzac in his decision to treat the life of the French government employé in an extensive novel, is hard to tell, but as early as the spring of 1837 he was already at work on *Les Employés*. The finished product appeared the following year, when it was published by Werdet under the title of *la Femme supérieure*. It showed considerable borrowings from the *Scènes de la vie bureaucratique* and the non-original portions were carried along unchanged in all the later evolutions of the novel, during which it received its present title of *les Employés*.

The *Scènes de la vie bureaucratique* consists of two parts, a prose introduction containing a series of pen-portraits descriptive of the officials and workers in a French government office at Paris, and a dialog section of forty scenes in which these same characters are interpreted through action and speech. Balzac drew his material largely from the prose introduction, though he here and there trespassed upon the dialog. In nearly every case he respected the intellectual consistency of Monnier's portrait by shifting the details belonging to one of the latter's characters *en bloc* to a single personage in his own work, thus creating a number of parallel figures in the two texts. At times the resemblance between these is very close, the language of the authors nearly identical. A case in point is that of M. Laudigeois and Joseph Godard, each a type of the model "jeune homme rangé" so frequently found in story books. A glance at their portraits reveals a very close likeness, indeed.

For example, Monnier thus enumerates the excellent moral habits of M. Laudigeois: " . . . se trouvant mal à l'odeur d'une

pipe, n'ayant de sa vie pénétré dans un café, candide comme une jeune fille, . . . élevé dans l'horreur des mauvaises sociétés: dans son lit à dix heures. levé à sept." Balzac's Godard is pictured as: "rangé comme une demoiselle . . . ayant les cafés, le cigare et l'équitation en horreur, couché régulièrement à dix heures du soir et levé à sept."⁴ Laudigeois-Godard evidently could not endure being out late at night under any circumstances, for the *Scènes* mentions him as "chapeau chinois dans la garde nationale pour éviter de passer les nuits au corps-de-garde," and *les Employés* as "fifre dans la garde nationale pour ne point passer les nuits au corps-de-garde." Behold now the reward of such virtue! Monnier declares he was "Envié pour leurs demoiselles par toutes les mères de famille de sa connaissance," and Balzac makes him ". . . très admiré par les mères de famille." But these good qualities do not render him interesting. Monnier qualifies him as "d'une apathie et d'une monotonie désespérantes," and Balzac as "monotone et apathique." He is not, however, devoid of little social talents. In the *Scènes* he is "doué de plusieurs petits talens de société, jouant assez proprement la contredanse sur le flageolet, empaillant des petits oiseaux," and in *les Employés*, "doué de plusieurs talents de société, jouant des contredanses sur le flageolet . . . Ce garçon savait . . . empailler les oiseaux." For his physical appearance, Monnier lets us know that he was "très maigre, yeux cernés et battus, peu de barbe," and Balzac agrees thus, "maigre et fluet, les yeux cernés, ayant peu de barbe." There is, however, a difference of three years in the age attributed to him by the two writers. His clothing was far from genteel. *Scènes*: "habits mal taillés, pantalons larges . . . bas blancs en toute saison, coiffure à petits bords, souliers lacés." *Les Employés*: "Joseph Godard avait peu de soin de lui-même: ses habits étaient mal taillés, ses pantalons, larges, formaient le sac; il portait des bas blancs par toutes les saisons, un chapeau à petits bords et des souliers lacés."

Another case of close parallelism is that of the two young "sur-numéraires," Eugène Morisseau and Sebastien de la Roche, both delicate young creatures threatened with tuberculosis. Monnier pictures

⁴In these and the following citations details are regrouped on a logical basis, and those not common to both authors omitted. The latter are generally very numerous.

Eugène as "faible, étioilé, menacé comme son père de succomber à une maladie de poitrine" and Balzac has Sébrstien answer Rabourdin, who offers him a cup of tea, "Maman me défend de prendre du thé à cause de ma poitrine." Both are unsophisticated young gentlemen who almost invariably refer to their mother as "maman." Each has been taken from his studies by his father's death, is trying to support his mother, and is unusually conscientious at his work in the office. In both instances the lad is under the powerful protection of a "chef de bureau" who overwhelms him with work but frequently entertains him at his own house and tries in vain to gain added financial remuneration for him from the higher officials. In fact, the descriptions of these two young men show no important differences.

Another instance of much the same kind is that of the "garçons de bureau," by Balzac called Gabriel and Laurent and by Monnier, Duflos and Laurent. Duflos is described as "ne se croyant pas encore assez d'importance pour sortir en ville avec un autre costume que celui du gouvernement," while Balzac remarks, "Gabriel et Laurent, ayant à peine dix ans de place, n'étaient pas arrivés à mépriser le costume du gouvernement." All the "garçons" are Savoyards.

These cases represent little more than word-for-word copying, a procedure little to the honor of the author of the *Comédie humaine*. In his defence, however, it must be said that this is not his only method. He often alters the text or the idea received and nearly always in the direction of greater concreteness and a more vivid rendering of life. An instance occurs in the case of M. Riffé, one of Monnier's most interesting "bureaucrates," a peculiarly methodical old bachelor, who notes all the small events of his hum-drum life in a diary, always dines at the same café, abhors children, plays dominoes, etc. These peculiarities are all faithfully transferred by Balzac to M. Poirét jeune, whom he has chosen to play this rôle. Among the details given by Monnier concerning M. Riffé is the following, "Arrivé le premier au bureau, il est le premier à lire le journal dont on l'a chargé de faire l'abonnement et de classer la collection." Here is how Balzac enlarges on this subject:

Chargé de faire la collection du journal auquel s'abonnait le bureau et celle du *Moniteur*, il avait le fanatisme de cette collection. Si quelque

employé perdait un numéro, l'emportait et ne le rapportait pas, Poiret jeune se faisait autoriser à sortir, se rendait au bureau du journal, réclamait le numéro manquant et revenait enthousiasmé de la politesse du caissier. Il avait toujours eu affaire à un charmant garçon; et, selon lui, les journalistes étaient décidément des gens aimables et peu connus.

Sometimes Balzac condenses, striving to render the original with greater pith and point. The case of the two "garçons de bureau" furnishes an example. Monnier develops a little drama, extending through the first nine scenes of his dialog, involving their attempt to keep M. Riffé from taking the morning paper. Balzac expresses that fact in one or two sentences. Occasionally also he gives an idea developed at length by Monnier a quite different treatment from that offered in the *Scènes*. A case in point is the peculiar story of M. Riffé's hat, to which Monnier devotes almost a page of narrative in his introduction. According to him, one of the clerks, tired of seeing the old gentleman's broad-brimmed hat eternally about the office, hastened its "decay" by breaking off a bit of it himself each day until finally nothing but the rim met its astonished owner's sight. Balzac was evidently impressed by this story, but thought to improve it by having Bixiou grease the hat with lard. The amazement of the old man when "thick perspiration" begins to flow over his forehead, his solemn conjectures, his visit to a hatter, etc., are detailed with great gusto, and Balzac adds a selection from the old bachelor's diary written on this momentous occasion. Monnier, let it be said, also quotes that interesting work, though not on the same subject. As a whole, it is to be doubted if Balzac greatly enhanced the story in his friend's "scène"; indeed, we may question whether it were not better omitted from both works. However, the limitations of the comic in both Balzac and Monnier, so far as delicacy is concerned, have long been recognized.

In the matter of plot Balzac is largely independent. Yet, it cannot be denied that most of the conditions that bring about M. Roubourdin's heroic struggle against intrigue and inefficiency are present in the *Scènes*. There, as in Balzac's novel, skill, virtue and generosity go unrewarded. Take for example the case of the hard-working, conscientious and generous "surnuméraires," as contrasted with the crowd of ignoble "hangers-on" and useless rich men's sons, who receive good salaries, do nothing in return and

never offer a tip or gift to inferiors. In *les Employés*, Antoine says of Sébastien de la Roche, who has just presented him the customary "étrenne" on New Year's day, "ce que j'appelle un bon employé, c'est un employé comme ce petit qui donne *recta* ses dix francs au jour de l'an," and Duflos, in the *Scènes*, says of Eugène, "J'ai en horreur tous les protégés, moi. Au jour de l'an qu'est-ce qu'ils nous donnent? Trois francs, tant que ça peut s'étendre; *ailleurs* que ce pauvre petit M. Eugène, qui ne touche rien, n'a jamais manqué de nous donner ses cinq francs." Balzac's Laurent speaks thus to the conscientious Sébastien:

Plus vous en ferez, plus on vous en demandera et l'on vous laissera sans avancement. . . . Eh bien, il ne m'écoute pas, il se tue à rester jusqu'à cinq heures, une heure de plus que tout le monde. C'est des bêtises, on n'arrive pas comme ça—A preuve, qu'il n'est pas encore question d'appointer ce pauvre garçon, qui ferait un excellent employé. Après deux ans! ça scie le dos, parole d'honneur.

In the *Scènes*, Monnier's Laurent and Duflos advise Eugène, ". . . vous restez jusqu'à cinq heures, quelquefois plus . . . voyez vous, dans les bureaux plus vous en ferez, plus on vous en fera faire." Then Laurent asks, "Combien y a-t-il que vous êtes ici?" Hearing the answer, "Il y aura deux ans au mois de mars," Duflos remarks, after Eugène's departure, "Il me fait de la peine, ce pauvre petit bonhomme, il n'est pas question de le mettre aux appointements." In each case the speech ends in a note of despair concerning the injustice reigning in the government offices. Duflos, in the *Scènes*, says:

On vous y mettra aux appointements un tas de flaneurs qui ne font rien de rien, qui disent qui font leur droit, et qui viennent une fois par mois pour émarger l'état des appointements! Encore nous faut-il souvent aller le leur porter chez eux à signer.

Balzac's Antoine expresses the same thought:

Quand je pense que je porte à émarger l'état des appointements à des farceurs qui restent chez eux, et qui y font ce qu'ils veulent, tandis ce petit la Roche crève, je me demande si Dieu pense aux bureaux!

Even the rivalries for the post of "chef," about which the plot of *les Employés* revolves, are mentioned, though not developed, in Monnier's "scène." In general, then, we must conclude that much of the ground-work for Balzac's novel derives from the *Scènes de*

la vie bureaucratique, though, in expanding his work and enriching it with concrete and living material, the creator of the *Comédie humaine* has maintained a certain amount of individuality and originality.

G. M. FESS.

University of Missouri.

A NOTE ON THE GOTHIC PARTICLE *þau*

The Gothic particle *þau* is, no doubt, identical with Sanskrit *tū* 'doch nun,' 'aber' (cf. Fick's *Vgl. Etym. Wbt. der indo-germ. Sprachen*,⁴ p. 174) and preserves, I think, in all its various usages the original adversative force of 'doch,' 'although,' 'but.'

The object of this article is to connect the adversative adverbial *þau* (in a certain passage) with its usage as a disjunctive particle. But in order to do this it is first necessary to present from the viewpoint of its original adversative sense a brief résumé of the particle *þau* in its various usages.

I. Disjunctive usages of *þau*

a. As a comparative particle (*þau* = 'than'): "sweþauh Twrai . . . sutizo waírþiþ . . . *þau* izwis," L. X, 14, etc. The adversative force of *þau* as a comparative particle has been clearly brought out by Dr. G. W. Small in his dissertation "The Comparison of Inequality" (The Johns Hopkins University, 1924, pp. 101-105).

b. As a particle introducing the second member of a disjunctive question (*þau* = 'or'): "*þau* niu wituþ," Rom. VII, 1; "Barabban *þau* Iesu," Mat. XXVII, 17, etc.

The adversative force of *þau* here is obvious; two propositions are contrasted with each other.

II. Adverbial usages of *þau*

a. As an explanatory particle introducing the conclusion of a condition (*þau* = 'then, in that case'): "jabai allis Mose galau-bidedeiþ, ga-*þau*-laubidedeiþ mis," J. V, 46, etc.

Here it is not so apparent as in the preceding case (Ib) that *þau* has an adversative force. But here likewise two propositions are contrasted with each other; cf. e. g. in the passage just quoted the two propositions, viz. "either believing Moses or believing me."

The use of *þau* here is, therefore, parallel to its use in disjunctive questions. The difference between the two usages lies in the fact that in the one case the two propositions are presented in the form of a question, in the other in the form of a condition. The translation of the Gothic particle *þau* in the latter case by 'then' (Germ. *so*) is misleading so far as the adversative force¹ of the particle is concerned.

b. As a colorless particle *þau* = 'perchance, indeed, forsooth,' etc.) *þata harjis þau ize maists wesi*," L. IX, 46; "*nibai þau þatei weis gaggandans bugjaima*," L. IX, 13, etc.

The fading of an original adversative force into a mere colorless sense is a phenomenon too common to require especial comment (with Gothic *þau* compare NHG. *doch* in questions denoting surprise).

Now let us turn to the passage in question where the particle *þau* is used adverbially and might be classified as a "colorless" particle, viz. John VII, 41: "*sumaih qeþun: sa ist Xristus. sumaih qeþun: iba þau us Galeilaia Xristus qimiþ?*" — "*μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ χριστὸς ἔρχεται*"; "Some said, This is the Christ. Others said, Does the Christ come out of Galilee?"

It is obvious, I think, that the force of *þau* here is primarily adversative and that the element of surprise, which *þau* expresses as the equivalent of the Greek particle γὰρ, is secondary.² Since the question "*iba þau us Galeilaia Xristus qimiþ?*" expects a negative answer (as the particle *iba* shows), it is equivalent to a denial of the previous statement, "*sa ist Xristus*." The adversative, as well as the surprise, element in Gothic *þau* here is therefore parallel to NHG. *doch* in such questions, cf. "*Kommt doch der Christus aus Galiläa?*"

My point is this: The usage of the particle *þau* here is essentially the same as its usage as the second member of a disjunctive ques-

¹ Cf. Germ. *und*, Eng. *and*, which was originally an adversative particle (Grk. *ἀντ*), also Goth. *ip*, *þan*, Grk. *δέ*, which may be either copulative or adversative.

² For the adverbial use of *þau* Streitberg (*Gotische Bibel**) gives the meanings *doch*, *wohl*, *etwa*, all equivalents of Greek *ἐν* (*καὶ*, *καί*) and in some few cases without a direct correspondence in the original Greek, but he makes no mention of our passage nor of the particle *þau* as an equivalent of Greek γὰρ.

tion (*pau* = 'or,' Ib), and as an explanatory particle introducing the conclusion of a condition (*pau* = 'then,' IIa).

As in both these usages of *pau*, we have in our passage two alternative propositions (cf. my remarks under IIa), namely, *whether* "he is the Christ" or "does the Christ come out of Galilee?" The first proposition is stated affirmatively, the second in the form of a question. In most other cases (cf. foot note 2) where adverbial *pau* is used (equivalent to Grk. *ἄν, καὶ, καί*) the alternative proposition² is not so apparent and therefore the adversative force of particle *pau* has been weakened so that it has come to be felt as a mere colorless particle (*doch* > *wohl, etwa*). In our passage, on the other hand, the original adversative force of *pau* is brought out into bold relief by the denial of the immediately preceding statement. Therefore, *pau* here can hardly be classified as a "colorless" particle—a classification which may be justified in most cases under this head mentioned by Streiter—*even tho* there is here also present in *pau* an element of surprise (= Grk. *γὰρ*), which may be rendered by a colorless particle like Eng. *then* and Germ. *denn*.

Formally *pau* is here an adverb ('*doch*') but this classification is only formal, for like *pau* in its use as an explanatory particle introducing the conclusion of a condition, the adverbial usage is essentially the same as its disjunctive usage in double questions. Had the preceding statement been put in the form of a question no one, I think, would hesitate to classify *pau* here as a conjunction; thus, "sa-u ist Kristus? iba *pau* uz-uh Galeilaia Kristus qimib?"; compare "bû is sa qimanda *pau* anþaran-u wenjaima?," L. VII, 19.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

² Cf. e.g. L. IX, 13: "nist hindar uns maizo fimf hlaibam, jah fiskos twai, niba *pau* (et *μηὲρ*) patei weis gaggandans bugjaima. . . ." "We have not more than five loaves of bread and two fishes, unless *indeed* we go and buy. . . ."

The two propositions under consideration are 1. "having only five loaves of bread and two fishes," and 2. "buying more." The original force of *pau* here is adversative, setting off the second proposition against the first. The thought of the second proposition is "but we shall have more, if we go and buy"; or stating it negatively, "unless *however* > *forsooth* we go and buy." Such an antithetical force of *pau* is not so apparent here as in the case of the passage under consideration.

ZU DEN DOPPELDRUCKEN DER GOETHE-AUSGABE 1806

In zwei in den Jahrgängen 1911 und 1912 dieser Zeitschrift erschienenen Aufsätzen¹ brachte ich den Beweis, daß von der ersten Cotta'schen Ausgabe (A) von Goethes Werken nicht, wie bis dahin allgemein angenommen, zwei Auflagen vorliegen, sondern daß von verschiedenen Banden dieser Ausgabe ein oder zwei Doppeldrucke existieren, die von Cotta ohne Goethes Mitwirken veranstaltet wurden. Besonders wichtig für die Textgeschichte ist der Doppeldruck A² des ersten, die Gedichte enthaltenden Bandes, den Goethe später unwissentlich als Vorlage für die zweite Cotta'sche Ausgabe (B) benutzte.

Von diesem Drucke A² des ersten Bandes habe ich kürzlich ein weiteres Exemplar erworben, welches mehrfach von den früher verglichenen abweicht. Das Exemplar, ein einzelner Band, ist broschiert und völlig unbeschnitten; es misst 130 × 210 mm., während gebundene Exemplare die Blattgröße 110 × 190 mm. selten überschreiten. Direkt am untern Rande von S. 63 des neuen Exemplares steht die (gedruckte) Zeile: *Dieses Blatt ist in ersten Band Seite 63. einzuschalten.* Diese Zeile, die das betreffende Blatt sofort als Karton kennzeichnet, wäre beim Einbinden natürlich weggeschnitten worden.

Die Seiten 63/64 enthalten die Strophen 1-6 des Gedichtes *Die glücklichen Gatten*. Daß hier neuer Satz vorliegt, läßt sich fast an jeder Zeile erkennen, obschon sich nicht die kleinste orthographische Variante entdecken läßt. Überhaupt zeigt gerade dieses Blatt nicht den geringsten Unterschied, weder an Orthographie noch Interpunktion, zwischen A, A¹, A² und dem neuen Kartonblatt. Dagegen ist anzunehmen, daß das durch den Karton ersetzte Originalblatt S. 63/64 bedeutende Abweichungen enthalten habe, denn sonst hätte ja der Ersatz desselben durchaus keinen Zweck gehabt. Bis jetzt ist es mir nicht gelungen, ein Exemplar mit dem Originalblatt aufzutreiben. Dabei sei bemerkt, daß das Kartonblatt S. 63/64 auf stärkerem Papier gedruckt ist, welches ganz oben am innern Rande als Wasserzeichen die untere Hälfte der Buchstaben BE erkennen läßt.

¹ *Die Doppeldrucke von Goethes Werken 1806-08*, Vol. xxvi, 133-137; *Zu den Doppeldrucken von Goethes Werken 1806-08*, Vol. xxii, 174-176. Vgl. die Literatur bei Goedeke, *Grundriß*, 3. Aufl. Bd. iv, 3, S. 7 f.; Bd. iv, 4, S. 75 f.; 109.

Dasselbe Papier, hier mit dem vollen Wasserzeichen BECK, liegt vor in Bogen 13 (S. 193-208), der sich auch textlich als Neudruck (A³) dokumentiert. Der Originaldruck A² liegt vor im Exemplare des Frankfurter Goethe-Museums, sowie in einem zweiten Exemplare in meinem Besitz.

Lesarten: S. 193, 14 Armen.—A² Armen. A³ Z. 20 Jeden A² jeden A³ 198, 5 Ach, wie A² Ach wie A³ 199, 2 Liebesgöttinn A² Liebesgöttin A³ 200, 5 Alles A² alles A³ Z. 10 wol A² wohl A³ 201, 3 andern, frey A² andern frey A³ Z. 8 Ach, da A² Ach da A³ Z. 11 Smaragd A² Schmaragd A³ 202, 9 Und A² Und, A³ Erstaunten A² erstaunten A³ Z. 14 Schleyer, A² Schleyer A³ 204, 3 Brav, A² brav A³ Z. 7 breit; A² breit, A³ Z. 11 Alles A² alles A³ Z. 18 hervor, A² hervor? A³ 205, 4 Alles es hätt', A² alles es hätt' A³ genung, A² genung A³.

Die für A² verzeichneten Lesarten zeigen die charakteristische, auch sonst zu beobachtende Tendenz dieses Druckes: verstärkte Interpunktion, große Anfangsbuchstaben, die Endung *-inn* anstatt *-in*; sonst ist *Smaragd* die einzige beachtenswerte Lesart. An sämtlichen Stellen teilt nun der zweite Cottasche Druck B die Lesarten von A², ein klarer Beweis, daß das von Goethe als Vorlage für B benutzte Exemplar nicht den neugedruckten Bogen A³ enthielt. Dieser hält sich genau an AA¹: nicht die geringste Abweichung zwischen AA¹A³ ist mir aufgestoßen. Im Gegensatz zu den gewöhnlichen Doppeldrucken, die durchweg einen schlechteren Text aufweisen, liegt also hier in A³ ein korrigierter, fehlerfreier Text vor. Weshalb gerade dieser Bogen neu gesetzt werden musste, ist nicht einzusehen, denn obschon der Bogen von A², der durch A³ ersetzt wurde, eine Reihe Abweichungen von der Vorlage AA¹ aufweist, so handelt es sich jedoch nicht um eigentliche Druckfehler, wie sie auf andern Bogen dieses Druckes vorkommen, die jedoch nicht neu gesetzt wurden. Man könnte also zu der Annahme neigen, daß von Bogen 13 des Druckes A² versehentlich eine ungenügende Anzahl von Abzügen gemacht worden sei, und daß der Nachschuß A³ einfach den Zweck gehabt habe, die Auflage auf die normale Höhe zu bringen. Dieser Annahme widerspricht jedoch das auf demselben Papier gedruckte Kartonblatt S. 63/64. Vor der Hand muß man sich also mit der Feststellung des Sachbestandes begnügen.

W. KURRELMAYER.

NOTES ON THE ELEGIAC DISTICH IN GERMAN

Johann Heinrich Hadewig, a writer of whom, in spite of his importance, little is known, and who has been completely ignored in all treatises on German poetics of the seventeenth century, shows a wide acquaintance both with the Roman elegiac poets (quoting frequently from Tibullus and Ovid to illustrate some point in his discussion) and with those of his own time. According to him the elegy receives its name from the matter which it treats and was at first among the Romans "ein Trauergedicht." The Latin "Genus Elegiacum" can be imitated in German verse. He illustrates this by the following verses on Opitz:¹

Unser Opitz hat unsre berumete Sprache geleret,
Welche mit höchstem Fleiss suchte der edle Poet,
Dem dancket mit Worten und mit frölichen Herzen,
Dass auch dem Teutschen, teutsche Getichte bekannt
Nun was unsterblich machet, das muss er erben,
Den Leib das Grab, die Sele der Himmel erhellet.

Morhof,² without giving the name of the author, cites the first four lines of Hadewig's attempt which is in itself remarkable for the lack of the otherwise prevalent rhyme: "In Teutscher Sprache haben auch einige die Latinisirende Carmina gemacht: Gleich wie dieses, das jemand auf Herrn Opitium geschrieben." He quotes from the edition of 1650³ in which the third line reads as follows: "Ey so danckt demselben vor die treffliche Muhe." And yet Hadewig (p. 94) expressly states that he himself is the author of the verses: "Also kan ich von unserm Poeten dem adlen Opitz nach Art der Lateiner das Elegiacum machen." Wackernagel and Borinski,⁴ to whom Hadewig seems to have been unknown, have been led astray by Morhof, quoting the lines merely

¹ *Wolgegründete teutsche Versekunst*, Bremen 1660, cap. iii: Von der Teutschen Poesi insonderheit, p. 94.

² *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie*, Kiel 1682, p. 533.

³ *Kurtze und richtige Anleitung*, Rinteln 1650.

⁴ Wackernagel, *Geschichte des deutschen Hexameters und Pentameters. Kleinere Schriften*, Leipzig 1873, II, 55; Borinski, *Die Poetik der Renaissance*, Berlin 1886, p. 33, note 3. The lines as quoted by Wackernagel from the second edition of Morhof's work can not be found in either the 1650 or 1660 edition of Hadewig.

upon the latter's authority and assuming the anonymity of the author. Borinski also misquotes Morhof as the latter does not state that these are the first samples of the distich in German. The second edition of Morhof's *Unterricht* appeared in 1700 at Lübeck and Frankfurt and not in 1702 as stated by Wackernagel.

In his *Teutsche Rede-bind- und Dichtkunst oder kurze Anweisung zur Teutschen Poesy*, Nürnberg 1679,⁵ Sigismund von Birken writes as follows concerning the distich in German: "Auf solche Weise, lassen sich viel Carmina der Lateiner tritt-richtig teutschen. Und dass solches auch mit ihren Hexametris und Pentametris von statten gehe, wird mit folgender Probe erwiesen." He then gives a German translation of a poem by Festus Avienus *De Venere et Vino*:

Wein und Weiber

Lasse, ja lass dich nicht den Wein und die Weiber bethören,
dann die Weiber und Wein schaden auf einerlei Weis.
Weiber und Wein, die können Leib und Kräfte verschren:
Weiber und der Wein stellen die Füße auf Eis.

Morhof (p. 624) comments on these lines as follows: "Betulius hat in seiner Anweisung cap. 3 gar ein Elegiacum, dessen Anfang dieser": (He then quotes the above four lines). "Diss klinget aber nicht so woll, weil die Verse allzu lang und die pedes allzu oft ändern."

Wackernagel (pp. 54, 55) says that Birk's attempt at the distich remained unnoticed. "Wenigstens kennt ihn sogar Daniel George Morhof nicht oder nimmt doch keine Rücksicht auf ihn . . . so konnte er nur auf die übrigen Poeten vor und neben Birken schelten." Wackernagel explains this so-called omission by saying that "Morhof an solche eigentlich verdeutschte Hexameter und Pentameter, wie die von Birken sind, nicht gedacht hat, sondern nur an jene die deutsche Sprache latinisierenden." Birk's distichs are from the year 1679, those of Hadewig date from 1650. Therefore, Wackernagel's claim (p. 53) that Birk's are the first of the kind will also not stand scrutiny. Morhof is again responsible for Wackernagel's ignorance of the authorship of Hadewig's verses.

Erdmann Uhse in discussing the distich says:⁶ "Die imitationes

⁵ Cap. III, par. 22, p. 30. Von den Gebändzeilen. De Versibus.

⁶ *Der wohlinformirte Poet*, Leipzig 1703, par. 48, p. 103.

auf die Lateinischen Genera, da man eben so viel und eben solche pedes in Teutschen Versen machet, als in dem Lateinischen genere enthalten sind. Z. E. In Genere Elegiaco:

Lachet ihr Liebgen fein lustig und schlaffet fein lange beysammen,
Kussot und labet euch wohl, dencket an keine Gefahr;
Streitet im Lieben, und mehret durch Hertzen die lieblichen Flammen,
Bringet was junges hervor, bleibet ein fröhliches Paar."

Wackernagel (p. 59) quotes these lines as "ein Paar Distichen vom J. 1708" on the authority of Docen. The lines, as may be seen from the above, are from the year 1703, the date of Uhse's work which is cited by Wackernagel upon the same authority without the name of the author. Borinski (p. 342) gives 1715 as the date of the work.

ROBERT BRUCE ROULSTON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

E. K.'S *ELF* < *GUELPH*, *GOBLIN* < *GHIBELLINE*

Of the etymologies suggested by the glosser of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* perhaps the most fantastic is the derivation of the English words *elf* and *goblin* from the names of the famous Italian factionists, the Guelphs and Ghibellines. Commenting upon *frendly Faeries* (line 25 of the "June Eclogue" at the beginning of the beautiful second stanza of Hobbinsol's reply to Colin's first speech) E. K. expresses his belief that there are no such creatures as "elfes," and declares that the "opinion" of them is maintained merely to frighten the young and the ignorant.¹ "But the sooth is," he continues

that when all Italy was distraite into Factions of the Guelfes and the Gibelins, being two famous houses in Florence, the name began through their great mischiefs and many outrages, to be so odious, or rather dreadful, in the peoples eares, that, if theyr children at any time were frowarde and wanton, they would say to them that the Guelfe or the Gibeline came. Which words nowe from them (as many thinges els) be come into our usage, and, for Guelfes and Gibelines, we say Elfes and Goblins. . . .²

¹ "To nousell the common people in ignoraunce, least being once acquainted with the truth of things, they woulde in tyme smell out the untruth of theyr packed pelfe, and Massepenie religion."

² Cf. *Faerie Queene*, II, x, LXXI.

It is not unreasonable to suspect that this half-learned etymology is not original with the *Shepheardes Calender* commentator. I have not been able, however, to come upon the derivation any earlier than E. K.'s use of it; but in the first repetition of it after E. K. which I have found,³ the lexicographer John Minsheu credits it to "M. Thomas in sua animadversione de Italia." Minsheu cites two possible etymologies for *goblin* and *hobgoblin*: (1) < French *gober*, 'glutere, vorare'; (2) < *Guelfe*.⁴ He makes no reference to the *Shepheardes Calender*,⁵ but quotes Master Thomas as his authority. Minsheu's reference apparently is to William

³ *The Guide Into Tongues*, 1617.

The earliest citation in *N.E.D.* for *Guelf* is E. K.'s gloss; for *Ghibelline* Gabriel Harvey's *Letter Book* (1573), where *Guelphe* also occurs.

⁴ *Goblin*. G Gobelin, ex gober, i gluture: quod faciebant credere pueris & infantibus, eos ab ipis maligna deuorari; because they made children beleue that these Goblins would deuore them. Aut potius ut placet Thomasio in sua animadversione de Italia: ubi dicit hoc vocabulum Goblin prouenire ex Gubellinis & Guelfis, duabus Italiae factionibus: quarum solum nominando pauor incutiebat pueris, &c. M. Thomas saith that this word Goblin comes from that famous faction of Guibellenes and Guelfes of Italie, the names whereof strooke a terrour into their children, as the name of Goblin or Hobgoblin among English Infants.

Hobgoblins, Night-walking spirits, quasi Robgoblins, Robin Good fellow, tradunt nonnulli nomina hæc Elves and Goblins usurpata ad terrorem infantium manasse a crudelissima illa factione Guelforum adversus Gibelinos, Hobgoblins of the Guelfes and Ghibelines two terrible factions in Italie, cuius modis vix usitata quoque est in Germ. ubi infantes terriuntur nomine & adventu *des Popelmans Hic autem Popelman fuisse fertur crudelissimus in Polonia tyrannus. Alij ad Gall. Gobelins a Gober. i. vorare.

In his definition of *elf* Minsheu gives no reference to *Guelf*. He takes *Elfe* or *dwarfe* "ab halfe, i. dimidiis, . . ." and *Elfe* or *night-mare* < Sax. *Alf*.

⁵ *The Guide Into Tongues* apparently makes no citation from Spenser. It records about fifty "old" or "Old English" words, the large majority of which are attributed to Chaucer; only seven of these are also found in Spenser. Minsheu very likely got these words from Speght's *Glossary*. Minsheu gives no attention to E. K.'s far-fetched derivation of *loorde* ("Julye Eclogue"), 'a dull heavy fellow,' from *Lord Danes*; he accepts it as from *λορδός*, 'humilis.' E. K.'s explanation is repeated directly from the *Shepheardes Calender* in Edmund Phillip's *The New World of Words* (5th. ed., 1696), is cited as late as Bailey's *An Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (16th ed., 1755), and is used by Chatterton.

Thomas's *The historie of Italie, a booke exceeding profitable to be redde: Because it intreateth of the astate of many diuers common ueales, how ther haue ben, & now be gouerned*, 1549.⁶ But Minsheu's memory very likely played him false here, for though Thomas gives in his *Historie* an account of the naming of the two Italian political factions, he suggests no derivation of *elf* and *goblin* from *Guelph* and *Ghibelline*. Minsheu may have had the following passage from Thomas's *Historie* in mind (fol. 141):

Guelfi and Ghibellines faction	Here is to be noted, that in the cōtencion betwene the emperour and the bishop of Rome, the whole Italian nacion was so divided in two partes, that in many houses you should have the father against the sonne, brother against brother, and commonlie one neighbour and one house against an other. And to encrease the mischief, ii brethren Dowchemen dwellyng in Pistoia (20. miles from Florence) fell out for this matter, and oftentimes openlie fought in maintenaunce of their division. Whereupon it folowed, that all the imperiall named them selves Ghibellini, after the name of Ghibell, one of those brethren, and the church part Guelfi, after tha name of Guelefe the other brother.
---	--

If Thomas had suggested the etymology *elf* < *Guelph*, *goblin* < *Ghibelline*, in his *Historie*, he would likely have repeated it in his *Italian Grammar and A Dictionarie*, which appeared in the year immediately following the publication of the *Historie*. The definitions of *Ghibellini* and *Guelfo* in *A Dictionarie* (1550) are as follows:

Ghibellini, the name of a partie in Florence, betwene whom and his contrarie called *guelfi*, the whole nacion of Italie was diuided.

Guelfe, a proper name, the ennemie of Ghibelline.

Without change, and without mention of *elf* or *goblin*, the defini-

⁶ Though Thomas does represent the Venetian gentleman as "proude, disdeinful, covetous, a great nygarde, leachous, spare of liuing" (fol. 83); though Neapolitans "are scarcely trusted on their wordes," are great flatterers and full of craft (fol. 114); though in some places in Italy the courtesans "seerne rather of the qualitie of a princes than of a common woman" (fol. 6)—in spite of these and other conventional criticisms of Italian life, Thomas's *Historie* contains great praise of Italy and its manners and customs.

tions are repeated in the second edition of *A Dictionarie* of 1562 and in the third edition of 1567.

E. K.'s etymology, without reference to him, continued to be offered as late as Skinner's *Etymologicon Linguae Anglicanae* (1671), wherein Skinner (q. v. *Goblins*) quotes Minshew as deriving *goblins* from French *Gobelins*, 'lemures, spectra,' and accepts it as a superior derivation to that from *Guelph* and *Ghibelline*, which his own "Præceptor" ⁷ had taught, but which, according to Skinner, "est mera conjectura."

JAMES F. ROYSTER.

The University of North Carolina.

NOTES ON THE E. E. T. S. EDITION OF THE NEWCASTLE NOAH'S ARK

Of his edition of the Newcastle *Noah's Ark* in "The Non-Cycle Mystery Plays" (*E. E. T. S.*, E. S. CIV), Waterhouse says (*Intro.* p. xxxvi): "The present edition is a reproduction of Bourne's version [in *The History of Newcastle-upon-Tyne* (1736) pp. 139 ff.] with a minimum amount of correction and emendation; all the other versions have been consulted and all variants of real importance in any of these have been given in the footnotes." The other versions here referred to are the reprints of Bourne's version in Brand's *History and Antiquities of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, Vol. II (1789), pp. 369 ff. [= Bd] and Sharp's *Dissertation on the Coventry Mysteries* (1825), pp. 221 ff. [= Sh], and the critical editions of the play by Holthausen, in *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, Vol. III (1897) [= H], and by Brotanek, in *Anglia*, Vol. XXI (1899), pp. 165 ff. [= Bk]. In the following notes I shall indicate those places in which W breaks away from B(ourne)'s version without notice, those in which he has misprinted the readings of any of the versions, and those in which important variants might well have been noted.

⁷ Junius's *Etymologicum Anglicanum* (ed. Iye, 1743) quotes from Meric Casaubon's *De Veteri Lingua Anglica*: "Mormolucii nescio cujus nomen, quo infantes terrere solent; ex Græcâ haud dubiè origine. Antiquitas hujus notionis & usus, futilem eorum conjecturum arguit, qui ex Italâ Ghibellinorum factione ortum crediderunt."

- Hdg. W "Shipwrights." So Bd; B reads "Shipwrights" and Sh "Shipwright's."
8. W "hoothe" without comment; but B Bd and Sh, followed by H Bk, have "hoope" (Bk: "hope").
- 10 fn. W says Bk has "With storms that both steer and stiff is," but Bk has "With stormis þat stere and stuff [is]". Further, in l. 12, B, as well as Bd Sh, has "wives," not "wiues."
13. W "Evermore"; B Bd Sh "Ever more."
15. Note that for "Henceforth," Bk has "Hethenward" both here and in l. 35.
22. W "Therefore" without comment, but B Bd Sh have "Therefore."
- 26 fn. According to W, H has: "Pitch and tar, beam and towe," whereas really H has: "Pitch, tar [and] beam and towe."
- 29 fn. W says that Bk reads: "Of alkin best, bird with wing," but Bk has "Of alkin best and [bird with wing]." Again H reads "all-kine" and not alle-kine" as W says he does.
41. W reads "shalt" which is the reading of Bd and Sh; B reads "shall."
44. Bk inserts "In faith" before "Away." H reads: "(Away [forthwith] I would thou went!)" and inserts the line between W's ll. 42 and 43.
47. Note that H reads: "For ever-ilk wight for-warks [him] wild,".
48. H reads: "And many [are] soiled in sin[ni]s seir"; Bk reads: "Is foulid in many sinnis sere."
51. Note that for "Of true timber," H reads: "With tree [and] timber" and Bk. "Of drye timber."
54. W reads "thretty cubettis" without comment; but this is the reading of Bk. B Bd Sh have "thirty cubits."
56. Note that H reads: "And in her side thou shear a door."
61. For W's "In earth," H has "In earth [there]" and Bk, "In [medil-]erth."
62. Bk's emendation of B's "that hath life-ward" is worth noting. It is: "þat leuand es."
64. W notes H's reading of this line. Bk's is no less remarkable: "þai sall be stormid þurȝ stormis stress."
65. For "Albeit," H reads "Al but."
66. H and Bk insert "Thy (Bk: "þi") wife" before "And" and drop "your." Bk also reads "on" for "in."
- 69 fn. W says B has "Into ship . . ." But B Bd Sh all have "In the ship. . .", which Bk changes to "Into schip" and H to "In[to] the ship."
71. Note that H alters "has" to "is."
- 74 fn. W says Bk suggests "prow," but H had already corrected to "prowe." Further, H and Bk both read "your," (Bk: "ȝour"), for B's "you."

77. Bk's reading maybe noted: "[A] Lord, be [þou] þan in þis stede."
80. H: "winters eld"; Bk: "wintir of eld."
86. H: "[Nor] spyer [nor] sprund [nor] spriut no[r] sprot."; Bk. "Sgyre, spout [nor] sprund ne sprot." Further, W prints "sprout" without comment but B Bd Sh all have "spront."
88. H and Bk read "mot" for B's "must."
93. H and Bk read "blin" here, and "mankin" in l. 91.
96. Note that Sh omits the second "were."
- 97 fn. W's footnote runs: "Sharp: *Put out harro*. Holthausen and Bourne: *Put off*. Sharp's version. *Put out* seems originally a mis-copying of *Out out*. Manuscript capitals are often troublesome." But, for one thing, Sh has "Put off Hairo"; for another thing, H has "Put off"; for a third thing, Sh did not go to the MS. at all.
99. For "smile," H reads "sike."
103. H reads "All-th[ough]" for "All this."
107. W's "lie" is the reading of Bd and Sh. Bk reads "die."
108. W has "Therto" without comment, but B Bd Sh have "There-to."
115. Here, as well as in ll. 134, 140, W gives all the credit for the emendation to Bk, whereas it should really be given to H.
117. Note that H adds "hie!" after "me."
120. For "secretly," Bk very properly reads "secrely."
124. Bk emends "say" to "sais."
126. W reads "tell thee how" without comment, but "thee" is absent from B Bd Sh. H first inserted it and Bk followed him.
131. W: "shalt"; so Bd Sh, but B: "shall."
135. For "is made," H reads "made is" and Bk "makid is." Further, W: "mightfull," but B Bd Sh: "mightyful"
137. H reads: "No longer shall he [lie nor] lain."
138. For "Believe, believe," H has "Believe," and Bk "Be leue,".
140. W: "thow," but B Bd Sr: "thou."
141. The "by" which W prints here without comment is found in Bd Sh but not in B.
143. For "like," H and Bk read "slike."
145. W: "atour"; B Bd Sh: "at our"; H: "at-our"; Bk: "all ouire."
148. Note that H reads: "Such good, as God doth send,".
150. W adopts H's "[good] day"; Bk simply changes "day" to "dame."
153. H: "Sit down beside me here . . ."; Bk: "Sit down here besiden me."
157. For "drank" of W and Bk, H has "drunk." Again, for B's "never none afore" ("never afore" of H and W), Bk has "neuir nane, but fere."

159. H and Bk read as two lines. The former reads:
 "I have [forsooth] nere lost my wit—
 By my fathers soul, [no more!]."
 The latter:
 "[In faith,] I haue nere lost my wit!
 Be my fadirs saule, [forbere!]."
- 160 f. Note that W's ll. 160. 161 appear as one line in B Bd Sh. Also, H reads l. 160 as W, but Bk has: "Noe, bot if þou till me [shew]." And in l. 161, Bk has "þou" for "you."
- 162 f. These two lines also are written as one line in B Bd Sh. Note, further, that for "give God", H has "give [to] God" and Bk "geue [gret] God".
- 164 fn. Bk adds "trewly" (not "trewely") after "layne", and "fra hie" to verse 166 (not 164).
165. W: "tell thee" without comment; this is the reading of Sh, B and Bd having "thee tell", which order H and Bk follow.
166. B has "Good", not "God", which is the reading of Bd Sh. Note also that H and Bk omit "of Heaven", Bk adding (as noted above) "fra hie" at the end of the line.
168. W: "fordo"; B Bd Sh: "foredoe" ("fore-doe").
169. Note that H reads: "With storms both steer and stiff," and Bk: "With stormis þat stere and stiff [is],".
170. Firstly, this line and the next are written as one line in B Bd Sh. Secondly, according to W's footnote, B has "me and thee", but B Bd Sh all have "thee and me". Thirdly, H's reading is worth citing: "But thee and me, [thereto]".
171. W: "wives". but B. Bd Sh: "wifes". Also note that H and Bk both end the line with "[their] wifes" (Bk: [þair] wifis).
- 176 f. These lines, in W, are in the order in which Bk has transposed them. B Bd Sh, followed by H, have W's l. 177 before l. 176.
179. Note that H changes "so" to "do".
- 186 ff. Note H's reading: "God help me [from aboon],
 To clink [on] you [a]main!
 God send me help [full soon],".
- 187 fn. W says B has "yon Nail too" but "yon" occurs in Bd Sh; B has "you".
190. H reads as B Bd Sh. Bk has: "þat all may wele done be."
192. For "hath thee help", H has "doth help" and Bk "will þe help".
- 195 fn. H and Bk have "cowld" (as B Bd Sh), not "cold."
199. Note Bk's emendation of "money" to menezze.
200. For "old and young", H has "[less] and [mare]" and Bk "ald and ȝing".
204. For "Dolphin, prince of dead", Bk has "Dilf, þe prince of dede".
206. Note that H reads: "That none of you [may] thrive nor thee!".

A NOTE ON DRAMATIC PIRACY

Unfortunately, no Elizabethan actor foresaw the importance of leaving a memoir describing in detail the technique of acquiring plays for production from rival companies who would object to infringements of their property rights. No one even explained the methods of adapting play texts, acquired legitimately or otherwise, for provincial touring. Hence it has been left to the ingeniousness of bibliographical scholarship to explain these matters. The eighteenth century, however, with its flair for memoir writing, was more explicit. Tate Wilkinson in *Memoirs of His Own Life* (York, 1790) has left an explanation of the means he used on two occasions to reconstruct play texts for performance in the provinces when he could not legitimately obtain acting versions. Since human nature varies little and traditions in the theatrical profession are strong, Wilkinson's methods are probably similar to those of less candid Elizabethan predecessors. Particularly interesting, in view of recent bibliographical theories as to the origin of printer's copy for Elizabethan plays, is Wilkinson's reconstruction of Sheridan's *Duenna* and of Macklin's farce, *Love à la Mode*.

After speaking of the frequency with which Foote's *Minor* had been acted after its printing, Wilkinson comments:¹

The fashion of not publishing is quite modern, and the favorite pieces not being printed, but kept under lock and key, is of infinite prejudice to us poor devils in the country theatres, as we really cannot afford to pay for the purchase of MSS.—The only time I ever exercised my pen on such an occasion was on a trial of necessity.—Mr. Harris bought that excellent comic opera of the *Duenna* from Mr. Sheridan; I saw it several times, and finding it impracticable to move Mr. Harris's tenderness, I locked myself up in my room, sat down first the jokes I remembered, then I laid a book of the songs before me, and with magazines kept the regulation of the scenes, and by the help of a numerous collection of obsolete Spanish plays I produced an excellent opera; I may say *excellent*—and an unprecedented complement; for whenever Mr. Younger, or any other country manager wanted a copy of the *Duenna*, Mr. Harris told them they might play Mr. Wilkinson's: hundreds have seen it in every town in Great Britain and Ireland. Mrs. Webb has acted the part of the *Duenna* in *my Opera*, as I call it, many nights at Edinburgh—Mr. Suett, the Jew, at York, &c.

The reconstruction of *Love à la Mode* is even more significant.

¹ *Memoirs*, II, pp. 230-231.

Although Wilkinson wanted to finish a season at Newcastle with Macklin's popular farce, he found it difficult to procure any stage copy. At length he assembled one in the manner described as follows:²

With patience and assiduity it was a possible work, and promised much credit and cash: To tell the truth I had by luck obtained the parts in the following method: The part of Sir Archy I had to prepare myself in; Mr. Garrick sent it to me at Winchester in the year 1760; Squire Groom from my friend Ned Shuter; Mordecai from Mr. Creswick, who had acted the part at Covent Garden; the lady's part from Mrs. Burden's copy, who played it at the same theatre: So I had only to make the Irish character of Sir Callaghan, which by the frequency of seeing the farce, and the help of the first act being printed in a magazine, made it with little trouble more than half ready to my hands; Sir Theodore, a part from remembrance; the rest of my manufacture.

Mr. Macklin, it is true, was justifiably angry; but mine, for his credit, was better acted, and more like his farce than the stuff given in every country town with purloined lines only: And Mr. Shylock to me proved himself no Jew, but a friend and a good Christian; he forgot and forgave, and occasionally favored me with permission to act the farce of *Love A-la-Mode*; though he after, jokingly, called me a great rogue.

Bibliographical critics of Elizabethan drama may observe in the late eighteenth century another variant of the "traitor-actor" method of the transmission of texts. John Bernard in his *Retrospections of the Stage* (Boston, 1832) explains how he assembled a text of Sheridan's *School for Scandal* for production at Exeter in the winter of 1788-89 by his friend, the actor-manager Hughes. Sheridan had taken pains to guard the play, Bernard asserts,³

not with any view of emolument, but in order to preserve his language from mutilation, and to prevent the play being produced at any theatre where the proper attention could not be paid to its "getting up."

Under these circumstances, I offered to attempt a compilation of the

² *Ibid.*, iv, p. 9. On another occasion (iii, p. 242) Wilkinson relates the outright theft of a play text from Foote: "I had acted (by having secretly obtained a purloined copy) his farce of the Devil upon Two Sticks; and having committed the fault, and well knowing he would quickly hear of my offence, I, by way of preventing his anger, informed him of my invasion of his property, thinking he would construe it as a very good joke." Sad to relate, Foote could not see the humor in the situation and had to be placated by further diplomacy.

³ Bernard, *op. cit.*, i, pp. 127-8.

comedy, if Mr. Hughes would give me his word that the manuscript should be destroyed at the end of the season. This was agreed to, and I set about my task in the following manner: I had played Sir Benjamin at Bath, and Charles at Richmond, and went on for Sir Peter one or two evenings when Edwin was indisposed; thus I had three parts in my possession. Dimond and Blisset (Joseph and Sir Oliver) transmitted theirs by post, on conveying the assurance to them which Mr. Hughes had to me. Old Rowley was in the company, and my wife had played both Lady Teazle and Mrs. Candour. With these materials for a groundwork, my general knowledge of the play, collected in rehearsing and performing it above forty times, enabled me in a week to construct a comedy in five acts, called in imitation of the original, "The School for Scandal."

If these synthetic texts had been printed, we should probably have versions resembling the authentic plays in the manner that, for example, the First Quarto of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* resembles the text in the First Folio.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

The Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

The Romantic Theory of Poetry: An Examination in the Light of Croce's Aesthetic. By A. E. POWELL (Mrs. E. R. DODDS). New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926. \$4.50.

Although the Romantics were nothing if not theorists, we have never had anything approaching a satisfactory account of their theory of criticism, or of literature, or of poetry. The reason is that what passes for literary scholarship is almost never united with the aesthetic sensibility and the philosophic cast of mind requisite in such a study. Possessing these powers in large measure and due proportion, Mrs. Dodds has now given us an admirable if not wholly satisfactory account of the English romantic theory of poetry. The six authors she has chosen—Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, De Quincey, Shelley, and Keats—suffice for her purpose, though in the interest of breadth one might wish she had added at least Byron, Lamb, and Hazlitt. The movement associated with these diverse authors achieved, as she says, a fairly coherent, definite, and comprehensive theory of poetry, which "throughout the nineteenth century . . . was the chief influence on English poetic creation and criticism." Questioned in our own time "by the leaders of thought," this theory is generally taken for granted

rather than questioned even in works of professedly scientific scholarship—a natural result of the fact that our scholarship developed in a romantic century. It is romantically refreshing, as one might say, to encounter a book like Mrs. Dodd's, in which the assumptions of romantic speculation are really examined critically.

In the writing of a book of this sort, three possible methods offer themselves. First, the method of simple exposition. Second, an examination of romantic theory in the light of the classical theory which preceded it and against which, in its late phase of distortion, the romantic theory reacted. This method Mrs. Dodds has left for some one else to pursue. She has selected, instead, the third method, which consists in examining the romantic theory in the light of the expressionist theory that followed it and carried further (toward if not to a logical conclusion) certain characteristic elements of the romantic theory. Hence the sub-title of her book.

In the introductory chapter on *The Romantic Ideal*, the author is concerned with "a particular form of romanticism," namely, that which gave the term *romantic* to a great modern movement. The spokesmen of this movement, she finds, were occupied with emancipating themselves from the old restraints of will and reason and from the mechanical philosophy forwarded by reason, and in cultivating instead emotional experience, sensibility, sensations, moods, impulse, instinct, wide sympathies, individual and unique feeling, rare and strange experience—above all, the highest experience, relation, through feeling, with a reality above the senses, an "infinite" approached through "intuition." In this mystical quest they sought aid from Plato, Neoplatonism, Boehme, Spinoza, Swedenborg, Kant and his successors. Poetry they conceived as an expression of this "theoretic" functioning of the human spirit. Since poetry affects its readers as well as its makers, it is also "practical," and in two ways: first, in the sphere of Action, it enlarges and ennobles man's being, man's power to experience; and secondly, in the sphere of Knowledge, it communicates knowledge of spiritual reality. In regard to mode of poetic expression, the romantics gave emphasis, above all, to the "indefinite," seeking "to rarify form, to create shadowy images, swaying and atmospheric, composed of faint intangible suggestions, not moulded into clear outlines."

This introductory chapter prepares us to read to good purpose the second chapter (also introductory), a summary of Croce's theory of aesthetic, in the course of which the writer throws into relief some of the agreements and differences between this theory and the orthodox romantic theory. Croce is quoted as saying, "He who reads the writers on aesthetic of the romantic period is

possessed by a forcible conviction that with them he has reached the heart of the investigation, a confident hope that he is very near to the discovery of the truth." At least they gave ample recognition to feeling, intuition, imagination, expression, the self, despite their vaguenesses and confusions. "If the concept of 'feeling' solved no problems, it called attention to one—the problem of delimiting the aesthetic from the other activities of man. . . . Croce's contribution to aesthetic consists chiefly in the attempt to give greater determination to that element of 'feeling' in which the romantics found the essential character of art, and thereby to provide criticism with a firmer philosophical basis in place of the discredited romantic formula" (pp. 16-17). In succeeding pages we note Croce's quarrel with the romantic conception of nature, of intuition, of reality; with the romantic tendency to confuse aesthetic and practical feeling, and to exalt feeling at the expense of expression or form. Although "the romantics made great progress towards overcoming the division between form and content," in its formal aspect their art was defective owing to premature and incomplete expression, and in its content failed (as *all* poetry must fail) to achieve "knowledge," though it aimed at the highest knowledge.

Perhaps the best way to show what happens when expressionistic theory is applied to romantic theory will be to examine one of the six chapters on individual romanticists, that on Coleridge, the greatest of the English critics of the age. The first section presents his temperament—his extraordinary senses and sensibilities, the rush of his commerce between impression and emotional response, his indifference to the powers that control and direct feeling, his astonishing capacity for expressing his state of mind, his fascinated addiction to reverie and "the chaos of his being." Repeatedly Mrs. Dodds shows fresh insight, as when she says, of "the want of self-respect and dignity in the letters," "He does not gather himself up to deal with the world; he writes himself down in his dismembered state, because he cannot perform, alone, the deed of pulling himself together"; or when she says, of his philosophy that was not a philosophy, "He lived, for the time, in the new universe he had created, and gave an exposition, not of the system, but of himself as affected by it—of his own being and aspirations under its stimulus." The contents of the second section, on the formation of his ideas, are summed up in the opening sentences:

"As Coleridge possessed unusually fine powers of expression, so also he early showed an unusually keen logical faculty. But as on the one side of his nature a passive acquiescence in sensation hampered and in the end replaced the creative activity, so on the other side the history of his development is the gradual substitution of dream for logic."

Apparently without knowing Claud Howard's book on *Coleridge's Idealism*, Mrs. Dodds concludes that the influence of the German idealists has been exaggerated, and that the influence of the Neoplatonists and the Cambridge Platonists "has not been sufficiently recognized." This section indicates that the writer has a far better command of philosophic works than is usual with literary students; and as much may be said of the ensuing section on Coleridge's debt to Kant and Schelling. With this discussion of the German element in Coleridge's thought the chapter is already more than half over, so that the reader is well prepared for the last and centrally important section, on his theory of poetry. This theory is summed up as follows:

"Poetry becomes the product of two mysterious activities. The first, reason [Reason], which is common to both poetry and philosophy, gives insight into the Universal. The second, expression, gives organic form to the ideas of the reason [Reason]."

Finally, in a brief critical summary, Mrs. Dodds appraises the aesthetic of Coleridge in the light of that of Croce. His fundamental error, it appears, lies in the confusion of intuition with reason, which in effect makes the poetic activity depend upon the philosophic, whereas, according to Croce, it is rather the philosophic that depends upon the poetic. "Intuition," in Croce's sense, is prior to the concept, and is of the individual, not of the universal. The object of poetry is therefore not, as Coleridge and Wordsworth fondly believed, truth, but expression. Truth, knowledge, is the peculiar property of the philosophers.

The virtue of Mrs. Dodd's book, however, does not reside in her demolition of the romantic position by means of her Crocean weapons. It lies in her patient study of romantic poetry and thought, her faithfulness to facts and texts, her penetration and elasticity of reflection, her literary tact and order, her exceptional honesty of mind. The last-named quality is illustrated on every page, but best of all in the final chapter, in which she admits, "I have tried to formulate and discuss certain difficulties, in Croce's teaching, of which I became aware only after the greater part of the book was composed, and which, though they have not caused me to modify seriously my earlier judgment upon the romantic contention, make it impossible for me fully to accept Croce's solution of the aesthetic problem." Her candor is, indeed, more surprising than her perception of the difficulties in Croce, an elusive thinker who sometimes appears to create difficulties for the sake of enjoying later the task of solving them while creating new ones. So much of his thought is fluid rather than firmly shaped that the attempt to oppose it to romantic thought is perhaps a little like adding fog to twilight. More illuminating, no doubt, would have been the use of the second of the three methods indicated

above, namely, an examination of the romantic formula in contrast with the formula that it historically displaced, the classical theory of poetry. The contrast between the exaltation of feeling and the exaltation of reason and the ethical will, the contrast between self-expression and objective imitation, the distinction between the classical and the romantic uses of imagination, the distinction between the classical and the romantic ideality, the distinction between the classical and the romantic meaning of terms like *infinite*—these would have been worthy of such hard thinking and subtle explication as Mrs. Dodds commands. If, as she says, the leaders of thought have abandoned the theory of romanticism, the time is ripe for the clear statement of some of these contrasts and distinctions, for the want of which our literary terminology (and behind the terminology, our thought itself) is oddly confused.

NORMAN FOERSTER.

University of North Carolina.

*German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1818,
with special reference to Scott, Coleridge, Shelley and Byron.*

By F. W. STOKOE. Pp. x + 174 + 5 appendices and bibliographies. Cambridge University Press, 1926.

The account of the English romantic poets with Germany has never been finally settled. The indebtedness of individual authors such as Scott and Coleridge, particularly in matters of detail, has been repeatedly studied and as often overstated. As early as 1811 Crabb Robinson remarked that a German friend of his had "pointed out striking analogies between Coleridge and German authors Coleridge had never seen." Since that time similar wholesale allegation of German influence upon these poets and their contemporaries has persisted. Margraf, Zeiger, Thomas Rea and, to a lesser degree, Brandl have been guilty of this sort of exaggeration.

Therefore the first desideratum in this field of study has long been a careful re-examination of the supposed influences, with a view to excising the irrelevant and unimportant and to revaluating those remaining. This task Mr. Stokoe has performed with good sense and acumen. He has presented clearly and fairly the personal relations of the various authors to German literature and at least in matters of literary detail, estimated the value of the relationships established. Furthermore, he has constructed from the copious materials at hand an account of the growth of the knowledge of German literature in England from Henry McKenzie's lecture

before the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1778 to Byron's admiration for Grillparzer's *Sappho*, which he expressed in 1821.

A second and almost equally needed critical work has been a thorough study of the complete effect of German writing of all sorts upon the entire literary movement in England from 1788 to 1820. Such recent extensive bibliographical studies as B. Q. Morgan's *A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation* and Laurence M. Price's *English-German Literary Influences* (to which Mr. Stokoe nowhere refers) have made available some of the facts upon which a survey of that sort could be based. Such a study Mr. Stokoe explicitly declines to make. He confines himself to what he calls strictly literary influence. He thus avoids mentioning the influence any aspect of German thought upon the philosophical ideas or even upon the aesthetic notions of these English poets. With almost all the authors under discussion this critical limitation is particularly serious. Their art was in a very intimate way the expression of their views of the world and of mankind. Their literary work divorced from their philosophical and aesthetic ideas loses most of its meaning. Mr. Stokoe's study therefore, often seems to be confined to verbal and stylistic similarities or to questions of specific detail which possess little more general significance. In such matters as these, however, the volume will serve as an almost indispensable manual.

Unfortunately the book possesses almost no literary quality of its own. It often proves to be a mere collection of loosely joined notes. Mr. Stokoe assembled the materials for this volume ten years ago and during the interval he has apparently lost some of his belief in their vitality. Such perfunctory and mechanical composition as he often shows, if discovered in an American book by an English reviewer, would be stigmatized as the natural result of the inevitably dull Ph. D. dissertation.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL.

University of Michigan.

The Ettrick Shepherd: A Biography. By HENRY STEPHENSON, Indiana University Studies, 1922.

The Ettrick Shepherd. By EDITH C. BATHO, Cambridge University Press, 1927.

James Hogg was one of the most brilliant minor poets in our literature. He was more in the limelight than some greater men, an important figure in the literary history of his day. His unique personality and picturesque career would furnish excellent material for a novel by Thomas Hardy. In view of these facts, it is surpris-

ing that modern scholarship neglected him so long; and the two short but scholarly studies here presented are doubly welcome. Interesting as the field is, however, it presents certain difficulties. There is a good deal of material accessible about Hogg; but very little of it can be depended on blindly. In his own elaborate accounts, he was constitutionally unable to be accurate and not always even desirous to be. His daughter's accounts are tainted by filial hero-worship. The statements of Lockhart and other contemporaries are sometimes animated by hostility, sometimes by the desire to poke fun. If a mass of forgotten manuscripts in the near future should be unearthed from Scottish garrets, we might find a good deal in the life of Hogg that needed adjusting.

But we must do the best we can with existing materials; and in the books before us these have been handled carefully and well. Professor Stephenson tells a readable narrative, and weighs his evidence judiciously. Miss Batho, however, has assembled more material; and her work, on the whole, must be considered the better book. Her volume is an excellent little study, accurate wherever we have checked it, full of sound literary criticism, and interestingly told. It is, for the present, the standard book on Hogg, on his life, individuality, the nature of his literary work, and his relations,—complicated and important,—to the literary currents of his day.

A general criticism that we would make on both of these books is that they do not go deeply enough into the psychology of Hogg's mind. He was brought up as a peasant in eighteenth century Scotland, when peasants drank deep and loved promiscuously. To say that he absorbed great quantities of whiskey is simply to say that he belonged to his age. With his powerful frame and his out-of-door life, he could carry a great deal of liquor; and though he guzzled much, he seems seldom to have been drunk. The fact that legend has not connected his name with stories of irregular amours means one of two things: either it means that dark but important chapters of his life still await investigation, or else it means that he was singularly continent and pure-minded in a licentious age. Either one of these conclusions leads to interesting trains of thought. Also, Hogg grew up in a lonely and traditional mental world that was almost medieval. The conceptions formed in such a world might excuse acts of his that otherwise seem unpardonable. Lockhart was furious because Hogg printed a paragraph implying the illegitimacy of Walter Scott's mother. To a nineteenth century gentleman this was an unspeakable outrage against the family of Hogg's lifelong benefactor. But to a medievalized rustic, the trifling shame of illegitimacy might have been swallowed up in the glory of descent from the bluest blood of Scotland. Hogg's brain was full of old ballads that might have encouraged such a conception. One of his own poems, "Mador of

the Moor," glorifies the unwedded mother of a child of Scotland's king.

Also, an interesting question, which is hardly touched on in these books, is the Celtic strain in Hogg, both in his blood and in some of the literary traditions that he followed.

But these problems lead us into a rather vague field of unprovable hypotheses. They are problems that every student of Hogg should carry in mind; but perhaps our authors have done wisely in not discussing them fully at present. Perhaps they can be discussed more effectually a few years from now in the light of new evidence. In the meanwhile, we are glad to see one of the most unique figures in literature given a worthy introduction to the world of scholarship.

FREDERICK E. PIERCE.

Yale University.

Dorothy and William Wordsworth, by CATHERINE MACDONALD MACLEAN. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1927. Pp. 129.

Wordsworth, by H. W. GARROD. Second Edition, enlarged. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1927. Pp. 231.

Miss Maclean's volume of essays should be judged as a series of sensitive and pleasant appreciations rather than as literary criticism. The criticism involved shows its limitations in such remarks as these comments on Dorothy Wordsworth: "She was the most remarkable writer of prose in a generation that included De Quincey" (p. 19); "in these journals . . . Dorothy shows herself the greatest of English descriptive writers" (p. 26); "while the deepest strain in Wordsworth's poetry came from the poet himself . . . for the remainder he was indebted to Dorothy" (p. 38). These judgments are extreme instances of a rather indiscriminating enthusiasm which pervades most of Miss Maclean's book; yet excessive enthusiasm is an amiable vice, and especially so in essays as gracefully written as these.

The second edition of Professor Garrod's book on Wordsworth includes another discussion of Dorothy Wordsworth. This essay is the only new material in the second edition, although Professor Garrod has "corrected one or two errors of detail" and apologized for, without altering, his severe references to Bishop Wordsworth. It is encouraging to see that so thoughtful and thoroughly solid criticism as Professor Garrod's could go into a second edition in four years; but one regrets that its distinguished author neglected this opportunity of recognizing Professor Arthur Beatty's book on Wordsworth. Surely every Wordsworth scholar should find

Professor Beatty's book useful, and most of all, Professor Garrod, who covers, in part, the same ground.

The new essay on Dorothy Wordsworth modestly claims that it is only "a tribute of affection," but it is much more than this. Perhaps Dorothy's place in literary history has never been so clearly defined as in this extremely satisfactory essay, which informs its criticism throughout with the spirit of affection which all Wordsworthians will demand in any treatment of Dorothy. Professor Garrod does not exaggerate Dorothy's influence, as so many have done, quite unnecessarily; and he recognizes that Dorothy's records of her observations in William's company are evidence of William's influence upon her, as well as *vice versa*. Avoiding these perennial errors, he encourages us to share in his loyalty to Dorothy without mental reservations.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR.

The Johns Hopkins University.

SOME RECENT AMERICAN EDITIONS OF OLD FRENCH TEXTS

As regards published work other than doctoral dissertations, three periods are discernable in the history of modern language scholarship in America. During the first production was chiefly limited to elementary text-books. In the second attention was directed largely to scientific articles. In the third and last effort has turned more and more to writing learned books. It is interesting to take note of certain results of this state of affairs in the editing of Old French texts.

Though it is no new thing for Americans to make editions of extensive Old French works—the first, the *Dit de la Panthère d'amours* of the lamented Henry A. Todd, dates from forty-five years ago—it is unusual to see so many of them as the last few years have produced. It is also worthy of remark that these editions reflect a change in the status of Old French work as a whole. The time when virtually every publication of a mediaeval French text was an *editio princeps* is long since over. Nowadays one sees generally second and occasionally even later editions.

The only text, however, which has had more than a dozen different editors—not to speak of editions that have appeared more than once—is the *Chanson de Roland*. Under such circumstances it is a source of real gratification to American scholars that the edition of Professor Jenkins¹ should occupy a distinguished po-

¹ *La Chanson de Roland, Oxford Version, edition, notes and glossary* by T. Atkinson Jenkins (Boston, etc., D. C. Heath and Co., 1924). cl + 378 pp.

sition. It is, moreover, more than an important contribution to the literature bearing on the *Roland*. It is the first example we have in the Old French field of an edition equipped with an apparatus of notes comparable in extent and thoroughness with those with which students of Greek and Latin have been familiar for centuries. The years of loving labor which were spent on the production of such a commentary have produced results of permanent value. The more one uses it the more one is impressed by the wealth of materials and ideas which it incorporates. The introduction and glossary are equally helpful. The text is modeled in a general way on the *Extraits* of Gaston Paris. It represents an effort to present, not a critical restoration of the text as it left the hands of the author, but a form of the poem adapted to the needs of elementary students of Old French. This purpose of the book has occasionally received too little attention, it would seem, from some of the reviewers.²

Alongside Jenkins' edition of a *chanson de geste* several American editions of *romans d'aventure* present themselves. Professor Nitze has given us a new and much needed edition of the first Grail romance of Robert de Boron.³ This text is not only of prime importance for the history of the Grail legend, but, despite occasional prolixity and obscurity, it has real literary interest. The author writes simply and easily enough, and certain stories, such as the legend of Veronica, are thoroughly well told. The edition of Francisque Michel⁴ has long been out of print. Moreover the text of Michel, although, as usual, "la copie approximativement exacte"⁵ of the only MS. known, was in need of some revision. This Professor Nitze has given it, and besides he has written a brief, but substantial introduction, summing up the results of studies which he has published elsewhere.⁶ In the first of these a careful study of the language of the poem, as well as other material,

² For notices see A. Jeanroy, *Romania*, I (1924), 613-616; M. Wilmotte, *Romania*, II (1925), 122-128; W. P. Shepard, *MP*, XXIII (1925), 104-109; J. D. M. Ford, *Speculum*, II (1927), 92-104; *MLJ*, IX (1924), 70-71; James Geddes, Jr., *Bulletin of the Modern Language Association of New England*, May, 1925; E. G. R. Waters, *The Oxford Magazine*, XLIV (1925), 134-135; also see *La Chanson de Roland commentée par Joseph Bédier* (Paris, H. Piazza, 1927), *passim*, and A. Hilka, *Rolandsmaterialien*, I (*Samm. rom. Uebungstexte*, 3-4: Halle, 1926), viii-ix and *passim*.

³ *Le Roman de l'estoire dou Graal, Classiques français du moyen âge*, 57 (Paris, Champion, 1927), xvi + 137 pages.

⁴ *Le Roman du Saint-Grail* (Bordeaux, 1841).

⁵ *Romania*, XVI (1887), 166.

⁶ *Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature* (Chicago, 1923), 300-14; *Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis* (inexactly referred to in Nitze's introduction, p. xiii, n. 3, as *Mélanges Schoepperle*; Paris and New York, 1927), pp. 135-145.

supports the new idea that the poem was written before 1201. The second study elaborates the brilliant conjecture that the name *Hebron*[s or *Bron*[s given to the Fisher King is due to a conflation of the Biblical character Hebron (Vulgate, Exodus, vi, 18, etc.) with the Celtic Bran, the latter of whom had already been mentioned in this connection by other scholars. An excellent feature, which editors of other texts would do well to imitate, is the insertion of a passage from the prose romance, ed. Weidner (Oppeln, 1881), to stop the gap after l. 2752.

Another *roman d'aventure* is *Amadas et Ydoine*, recently published⁷ by Professor John R. Reinhard, who had previously published *Eledus et Serene*.⁸ The first edition of *Amadas et Ydoine*, that of Célestin Hippeau (Paris, 1863) has long been out of print. Moreover, whether we accept the amiable view of Paul Meyer⁹ that Hippeau was "le plus négligent et le plus ignorant de tous les éditeurs de textes du moyen âge," or the witty judgment of Foerster,¹⁰ who saw in him "einen altfranzösischen Trouveur des 19. Jahrhunderts," the first editor was clearly conscienceless to the point of incompetence. Consequently the new edition is decidedly welcome. It has moreover the advantage of printing for the first time a fragment of 1130 lines contained in the Vatican MS. Palatinus lat. 1971.¹¹ This fragment was known at least as early as 1898 to the late W. Foerster¹² who intended to make a new edition of *Amadas*. It was rediscovered by Karl Christ,¹³ who identified it tentatively (*l. c.*, p. 80, n. 1) with Foerster's fragment. Professor Reinhard¹⁴ affirms the identity of the two texts, but without giving his reasons; it would be of interest to know them.

⁷ *Classiques français du moyen âge*, 51 (Paris, Champion, 1926), x + 299 pages.

⁸ *Le Roman d'Eledus et Serene* (University of Texas Studies, Austin, 1923).

⁹ *Romania*, xxi (1892), 414, cited by Friedwagner, ed. of *La Vengeance Raguidel* of Raoul de Houdenc (Halle, 1909), xviii.

¹⁰ *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, II (1878), 78, cf. Friedwagner, *l. c.*

¹¹ The number of this Ms. is misprinted as "pal. 1871" on p. iv of the introduction. For other misprints of the edition see F. P. Magoun, Jr., *Speculum*, I (1926), 360. Add 4505 *balzon* for *blazon*, 5298 *coucant* for *coucant*. 1231 read *jentia* for *gentia*; cf. l. 1648 and *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, xiii (1889), 96. According to the collation there printed (p. 97), the following further corrections are needed: 1839 read *gerpirent* for *guerpirent*; 1884 *honneur* for *houneur*. *Aines* (see *glossaire*, p. 294, s. v.) requires no emendation; cf. Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfrz. Wb.*, s. v. *aine*.

¹² *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, xxii (1898), 529.

¹³ *Zentralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen, Beiheft XLVI* (1916), 80-1; cf. *Romania*, xlvi (1920), 151. Professor Reinhard does not mention Christ.

¹⁴ P. v; see also his companion volume, *The Old French Romance of Amadas et Ydoine, An Historical Study* (Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1927), p. 127. On the latter work cf. the valuable review of Professor Nitze, *Speculum*, II (1927), 479-482. See also M. Roques, *Romania*, lxxii (1927), 446.

In printing this fragment, as well as in reprinting that in Göttingen, the editor has been wise in simply giving both texts, and not presenting us with Old French verses of his own making, representing a *pastiche* of two widely different poems. It would have been of interest, on the other hand, if he had continued in detail upon the Vatican fragment the investigation made by Gaston Paris upon the Göttingen fragment, from which Paris concluded that the author of the poem wrote in Anglo-Norman. It is highly probable that Reinhard is right in accepting (p. v) the conclusion of Paris and Foerster¹⁵ that the first version of the poem was in Anglo-Norman. He also seems well inspired in stressing¹⁶ connections between our poet and Chrétien de Troyes; such plays on words as those in 474 ff., 979-80, 1095 distinctly remind one of the great *Champenois*. It is clear, then, that Professor Reinhard has done useful work upon this old world story, remarkable for its mediaeval Victorianism—the unusual combination of conventional piety and even orthodoxy with deep interest in romantic love. The poem he has made accessible again is also notable as a fluent and pleasing monument of one of the best periods of French style.

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

Flaubert's Youth. By LEWIS PIAGET SHANKS. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1927. Pp. xi + 246.

This scholarly book is a study of Flaubert (and thus in part of the men of his generation), from his birth to the age of twenty-three, with a few necessary details concerning his heredity and environment and their probable influence upon him. The events and incidents of his life during these early years are well known to scholars and Dr. Shanks has not been able to add materially to our knowledge of them, but he has, with vast patience and untiring zeal, made a real and lasting contribution by linking up a great deal concerning Flaubert—character, readings, love affairs, illusions, and desires—with all his early works and frequently with those of his maturity. He traces for us Flaubert's development from the days of the childhood plays on the billiard table through the first *Education sentimentale*, from the frankest and most complete Romanticism to at least a partial Realism.

The timid and passionate boy, filled with his Romantics (in this case Rousseau's *Confessions*) writes his *Mémoires d'un fou*, for example and puts into it his passion and his despair, for his

¹⁵ *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, xxxviii (1917), 108-9.

¹⁶ *The Old French Romance*, pp. 19-20, 27-30, 131, and *passim*.

beloved is a married woman and his love is unrequited; his pessimism and gloom, which leave nothing but the striving for the infinite in the beautiful; his philosophical studies, reflected in his inquiry into the meaning of God, Eternity, and Infinity; and his sufferings. Such a work has, therefore, "unique documentary value." A somewhat more mature work, *Novembre*, bound up in various ways with preceding juvenilia, contains "all the ecstasies of a timid, sensuous and imaginative adolescent," followed by indifference and disgust, longing for death and thought of suicide; he relates "his hour of mystic ecstasy," probably due to his first love, etc. With great thoroughness and unflagging energy S. follows the story and shows us how Flaubert is in it all through and how everything in it is Flaubert. The hero seeks in vain a certain girl as Flaubert had sought Mme Foucauld. Flaubert had had a vision concerning her in which a white veil plays a part, and this veil reappears in *Madame Bovary*, in the first *Education sentimentale*, in *Le Candidat* and in *Salammbô*, (which makes one reflect how personal the later books of Flaubert are in spite of all his love for impersonality). The work treated at greatest length by Dr. S. is naturally the first *Education sentimentale*. He gives us a masterly treatment of everything concerning it, and proves that Jules was Flaubert, not only as he was, but as he would have liked to be and as he later actually became, with all his various feelings, thoughts, and judgments. He shows us Flaubert's progress toward objectivity, his recovery from some of his early illusions and, in general, from his past, his aloofness from action, and his decision to live for beauty in art, "not only Flaubert's recovery from subjective Romanticism, but his conversion to the religion of Art."

S. has forestalled the only serious criticism that can be made of his book by the following sentence in the Preface: "The importance of the subject should therefore excuse the prolixity of this study, undertaken in view of a popular biography now under way." This excuse seems somewhat insufficient. The accounts of the various works seem longer to me than is necessary to explain their connection with Flaubert, his sources, or other works. Concerning *La Danse des Morts*, for example, all possible places in sculpture, design, or literature where such a dance occurs are listed as possible sources, followed by a two page summary of the work. For *Smarh* S. has added some sources, and a summary with commentary fills the next nine pages. While in the details given he adds to our knowledge of these connections, the summaries are surely drawn out more than is necessary. Similarly the quotations are too numerous and many of them are longer than they need be. At times of course nothing but a quotation would do for the pur-

pose, but frequently Flaubert's sense would serve quite as well as his words.

I am not convinced that Du Camp's account of Flaubert's illness (p. 161) or the explanation of it, given by Du Camp and Goncourt, as a form of epilepsy (p. 162) are inspired by jealousy. How could these literary men be able to distinguish between epilepsy and hystero-neurasthenia? And in what manner could their jealousy be better satisfied if it were the former rather than the latter, which sounds far more formidable to me. Nor does the statement (p. 55) "This is, indeed a 'Sailor's Rest,' but probably seen from the side-walk" carry conviction. It is surely not unheard-of for boys in their 'teens to see the inside of taverns in France or elsewhere. It seems to me that S. makes too frequent use of the future tense after the manner so common in France, that is when the event is in the future from Flaubert's standpoint but not from ours: "which he *will give* to Madame Bovary (p. 45)," seventy-five years after he gave it to her; "he *will put* one on the *prie-Dieu*" (p. 50) long after he has done so; "he *will apply* it to himself" (p. 108), etc. This usage seems an affectation to me, unless it implies frequency, which in these cases it does not.¹ The book is provided with an "Index of Authors Mentioned," and "Toward a Bibliography." One is somewhat astonished not to find in the latter list the work most frequently cited in the text: Coleman's *Flaubert's Literary Development*.

OTTO PATZER.

University of Washington.

Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite. By C. A.

WILLIAMS. University of Illinois studies in language and literature, x, 2 (May, 1925); xi, 4 (November, 1926), pp. 1-139.

Professor Williams supplies us with an elaborate and careful discussion of a legend variously known as the legend of Sts. Chrysostom, Albanus, Paul the First Hermit, etc. The legend takes rise in the Gilgamesh epic, behind which lie ritualistic practices designed to ensure the fertility of the fields. The division of materials which Professor Williams adopts is purely chronological, *i. e.*, pre-Chris-

¹ The proof-reading was done with great care. The only slips noticed were the following: Des charmes for Descharmes, p. 85, l. 20; *by* for *my*, p. 88, l. 25; an inverted apostrophe, p. 90, l. 19, and missing quotation marks, p. 243, l. 8. On page 178 (end of paragraph) there is something omitted, such as "except for short periods," for Flaubert left Croisset frequently enough. And what is the subject of *go*, p. 108, l. 14?

tian and Christian. There are naturally enough enormous differences between the two classes of stories, but the problems in each class, so far as they are examined, are essentially the same, *viz.*, the tracing of literary developments and interrelations. For the purpose of this review I prefer to divide his study in a different fashion, although the parts are then far from equal. It may be regarded as the history of a literary tradition which found culmination in the legends of Sts. Alban and Chrysostom and as a demonstration that stories arise from ritual. The first of these matters is treated at length and the second is summarily dismissed.

Naturally the bulk of the study is occupied with the history of the legend's growth and dissemination. Out of the fragments of the Gilgamesh epic we reconstruct a story of a beastlike man who is seduced by a courtesan and who by union with her brings prosperity and increase to the land. This Assyrian story has striking parallels in Sanskrit legend, but Professor Williams avoids (p. 31) a direct assertion concerning their relation. Old Testament story also affords a number of more or less significant resemblances to figures or episodes of the Gilgamesh epic. In the gnostic material and with the rise of patristic literature Professor Williams finds it possible to trace the development with somewhat more assurance. By adapting itself to new cultures and new lands the story passed from third or fourth century Egypt to fourteenth and fifteenth century Europe. This history of the legend is well done—particularly well done in its effort to relate the legend's form to the age—although here and there longer study might bring greater clarity regarding the inter-relations of versions. On the other hand, such problems are often enough the task of special disciplines and solutions can scarcely be demanded of Professor Williams.

On turning our attention to the suggested ritualistic origins of the legend we find that this is nowhere discussed in detail.¹ He seems unaware of the great interest which his study has as one of a series of essays which find origins in primitive rituals. The most interesting and the most disputed example is, of course, the origin of the Holy Grail in ritualistic practices. A similar origin has been suggested for the Eddic poems. Perrault's tales, in other words *märchen* in general, have been interpreted in this way. But in no one of these essays do we find any discussion of the fundamental assumptions on which the whole study rests. What sort of stories are of ritualistic origin? What evidence can be adduced to prove ritualistic origins? What validity has such evidence? What flaws are likely to be found in it and how may they be cured? A comprehensive discussion pro and con—a discussion which characterizes the arguments for ritualistic origins and fixes their value—is a desideratum. Such a discussion is all the more needed at the

¹ See, *e. g.*, pp. 19, 23, 31, 34.

moment because ritualistic origins are being proposed for a great variety of themes. To be sure, Professor Williams did not regard a critical examination of the premises of the theory of ritual origins as falling within his sphere of interest, rewarding as such an examination would have been.

ARCHER TAYLOR.

University of Chicago.

Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años. Por C. SÁNCHEZ-ALBORNOZ. Madrid, "Revista de Archivos," 1926. xv + 211

El libro de que nos ocupamos es una reconstrucción amena pero cuidadosamente documentada de la vida en León en el siglo X. El Sr. Menéndez Pidal la caracteriza como "una obra de fino arte novelesco y de sólida ciencia histórica." Divídese el libro en seis estampas en las que el autor hace revivir las costumbres y la vida de la corte leonesa de los años del 900. Acompañan a estas estampas miniaturas sacadas de manuscritos de la época en que se ilustran los trajes, muebles, armas, instrumentos de música y otros artículos de uso corriente en el siglo X en León.

Precede a la narración un prólogo del Sr. Menéndez Pidal en que hace resaltar "la falta de una norma lingüística fija" en la corte leonesa de aquella época. Limitase a señalar "algunas particularidades del lenguaje que usaban los leoneses del siglo X, descubriendo algunas de las ideas lingüísticas y de las modas del hablar que entonces corrían." Como causa principal de la vacilación lingüística en la corte leonesa de ese tiempo, indica la influencia de Galicia y Asturias.

En las copiosas notas que ilustran el texto se citan infinidad de detalles extremadamente curiosos e interesantes. Precios de artículos y animales; afluencia de provisiones y mercaderes a la plaza; incidentes de la vida doméstica, todo está detallado con exactitud. Mas la minuciosidad de detalles en nada afecta la claridad y gracia de la narración. Las citas documentales proceden en su mayoría de contratos y diplomas de notarios. Estos documentos, escritos en el latín escolástico de la época, aunque fragmentarios, son de gran interés lingüístico, sobre todo por los datos bibliográficos.

El autor cita amenudo su obra aún inédita *Instituciones del Reino Asturleonés*, en donde estudia mucho más extensamente algunos asuntos que apenas toca en la presente obra.

Siguen a la narración apéndices que contienen una lista cronológica con indicaciones bibliográficas de los documentos utilizados; un glosario con bibliografía detallada, y un mapa de León reconstruido según los documentos citados. Todo está esmeradamente

impreso. No podemos decir que sea obra indispensable en toda biblioteca. El autor no se ha propuesto darnos un libro de consulta sino una narración amena dentro de la veracidad histórica. Es obra sumamente agradable y útil que recomendamos al lector curioso; especialmente a los que se dedican al estudio de las instituciones de la Edad Media.

A. REY.

Indiana University.

A First Spanish Grammar. By C. CARROLL MARDEN and F. COURTNEY TARR. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1926.

Se trata de un libro muy elemental para uso de principiantes. Los autores, buscando ante todo un resultado práctico, han tenido el buen acuerdo de no seguir por el camino trillado. La exposición es atrevida y original, aunque un tanto desordenada. Varias materias que gramáticas similares suelen tratar en las primeras lecciones han sido reservadas para el final, y viceversa. Las reglas son pocas y breves. Los ejemplos adecuados.

No todos están sin embargo felizmente elegidos. Pág. 28: *Juan es un alumno de la clase*. Precisamente en este caso puede suprimirse el artículo indefinido. Págs. 41 y 57: Las frases *María lee su libro de ellas* o *un pequeño niño francés* siempre sonarán mal en castellano. En cambio, v. pág. 52, puede decirse perfectamente *un hermoso caballo*. Pág. 114: *¿Ha hablado usted jamás con él?* Falta la negación antes del verbo. El mismo error se repite en otros lugares.

Estos ejemplos mal aplicados ponen en tela de juicio la utilidad de las reglas precedentes, que además no siempre están bien redactadas. Es indudable que en ciertos casos se ha querido decir lo contrario de lo que se dice. Léase lo relativo a la pronunciación de la *b* en la pág. 3. Tampoco está clara la advertencia sobre el acento en los pretéritos irregulares, pág. 90. Ni la razón para excluir de la lista de apocopados el adjetivo *mal* que se usa a menudo: *un mal sujeto, un mal paso, un mal síntoma, un mal golpe*, etc.

No escasean, sobre todo en los ejercicios, las frases mal construídas por influencia del inglés. He aquí para muestra algunas faltas que saltan a primera vista: *sala de clase*, pág. 9, por *clase*; *queda a comer*, pág. 50, por *se queda a comer*; *lontano*, pág. 52, por *lejano*; *algun amigo*, pág. 59, por *un amigo*; *están*, pág. 107, por *hay*; *quebrantada la pierna*, pág. 222, por *rota la pierna*; *el que no quieres*, pág. 227, por *el que no quieras*. Los adjetivos *feliz* y *hermoso* están casi siempre impropriamente usados, y los pronombres personales se emplean demasiado sin necesidad.

Los descuidos señalados, disculpables todos, no impiden recomendar a los principiantes esta pequeña gramática, que tiene entre otras ventajas, la importantísima de simplificar acertadamente las mayores dificultades de la sintaxis española.

JOSÉ ROBLES.

A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne. By EVELYN M. SIMPSON. Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1924. Pp. 367.

Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra: John Donne, Richard Crashaw. By MARIO PRAZ. Firenze, Societa An. Editrice "La Voce," 1925. Pp. 298.

The Poems English Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw. Edited by L. C. MARTIN. Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. xcii, 473.

The work of Mrs. Simpson and Dr. Praz testifies to the unusual interest in the study of Donne in late years. Beginning with the issue, in 1912, of Professor Grierson's noble edition, there is a record of investigation that has greatly enlarged our knowledge of the man and his work. Professor Louis Bredvold has published several valuable monographs. Logan Pearsall Smith published an admirable anthology from the sermons (Oxford, 1919), making accessible the best of the prose so chosen and edited as to open up a body of early seventeenth-century English prose previously almost unknown except to a few specialists. For Mr. Fausset's book (Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1924) not so much can be said. It is an exaggerated and melodramatic essay which derives from earlier estimates of Donne, knows little about the period to which Donne belonged, and does not inspire confidence in its thesis or method. For example, it takes no account of the important work of Mr. Grierson on the chronology of Donne's secular poetry, a chronology which destroys the foundation of Mr. Fausset's thesis. Miss Mary Paton Ramsay issued in 1924 a second edition of her dissertation *Les Doctrines Médiévales chez Donne* (Oxford Press), but it is practically a reprint of her first edition except for some bibliographical additions. With some of her positions Dr. Bredvold's work takes issue sharply. The book is of enduring value, however, in showing once more the continuity of intellectual history; it errs in its impression of Donne's isolation from his age. Medievalism survived in Donne, certainly, as it survived in Spenser, in Milton, and in Puritan theology, but this survival does not completely explain Donne's genius.

Mrs. Simpson adds materially to our knowledge. For one thing, she prints for the first time a collection of letters of extraordinary interest. She stresses the fact that though Donne's mind was trained in medieval methods, it was in some ways strikingly modern. She shows the value of the prose in relation to the poetry, and thus controverts the idea of Fausset that Donne's life is to be divided into compartments or eras labelled paganism, penitence, and the like, or treated as a series of paradoxes, a chaos in which primeval elements strive for mastery. She treats Donne as typical of the period of disillusion that followed upon the golden years of Elizabeth. Professor Grierson, indeed, had already supplied material in defence of this view, and in his commentary had shown the importance of the prose as a means for understanding the poetry; Mrs. Simpson discusses the matter in detail, and, with Smith's collection of prose pieces, supplies means for testing these conclusions.

The chief value of the essay on Donne by Dr. Praz is in its detailed analysis of certain earlier poems, with the comparisons which he draws between them and poems on similar themes by contemporary English poets, Campion for example, and, for the "conceits," with Dante, Petrarch, and later writers of love lyrics in Italy. An example is the commentary on "Love's Deity," which Mr. Grierson does not annotate. To Dr. Praz the basis of Donne's culture was indeed medieval, but it was modified by his metaphysical bias, by his keen sensitiveness to contemporary matters, and by his interest in Italian love poetry. So Marlowe and Donne are compared to show the difference between the earlier Elizabethan imitation of Ovid and Donne's metaphysical "translation." As he sums it up (p. 121): "Alla natura il Donne contrappone il suo mondo cerebrale, agli elementi sensuali—musica e colorito—così in onore presso gli elisabettiani, la geometrizzazione logica e l'astruseria; alla mitologia e alle veneri dello stile le immagini e i tropi desunti dall'esperienza cotidiana o dalle cognizioni scientifiche: il troppo vicino o il troppo remoto." This is not new; it gains fresh interest through the manner of presentation and the wealth of illustration.

According to Dr. Praz, the clue to the interpretation of Crashaw is to be found in Bernini's *Estasi di Santa Teresa*. In the picture, as in the poetry, there is no suggestion of the more heroic aspects of religious martyrdom. Crashaw represents the contemplative enthusiasm, ecstatic and feminine, pervaded by a morbid sensualism, that is the mark of his school; Donne, on the other hand, suggests a speculative, nervous, but virile intelligence. The paradox between the earlier and the latter Donne (on which I think Dr. Praz is inclined to lean too heavily), answers to the dramatic contrast between Crashaw's youthful life in the house of the stern

Puritan who was his father, and his refuge first in the monastic seclusion of Little Gidding and later in his union with Rome and his death at Loreto. Mr. Martin limits himself more closely to the career of Crashaw as an individual than does Dr. Praz, whose main interest is in the poetry; the two essays supplement each other admirably. The career of Crashaw takes on new meaning. An instance is to be found in the use of the important letter of 1643/4, which though known since 1912 has not heretofore been so carefully edited. Crashaw often watched in Little St. Mary's Church near Peterhouse; in an outburst of Puritan fanaticism both church and college were despoiled of their treasures; he abandoned his fellowship, went to Holland, and from Leyden wrote a long letter which survives to add its testimony concerning that tortured epoch. It is a document to put alongside the records of Little Gidding, the correspondence of Hartlib, the heartbreaking struggles of Dr. John Worthington, Evelyn's dream of a retreat from a world that was too oppressive, the Invisible College of 1645, and all the other evidences, of the effect of the times upon some of Britain's most sensitive intellects. The grotesquerie of the metaphysical wits finds counterpart in the things that men did, in the torments of the times.

Of Mr. Martin's edition it is sufficient to say that he has supplied us with a definitive text, based upon exhaustive study of the documents, and with a readable and well-attested life. In his excellent idea of reprinting from successive editions the poems which Crashaw expanded and corrected to a degree not easily represented by the ordinary methods of textual criticism, he has supplied means for tracing the development of the poet. The commentary is highly condensed but useful. The account of Crashaw's influence and early testimonies to his reputation, though brief, opens the way for future additions. Mr. Martin appears to have missed the interesting fact that John Worthington planned to supply materials for a third edition of the poems in 1667. The evidence is in a letter to Dr. Ingelo (*Diary and Correspondence*, Chetham Soc., xxxvi, 247-8) in which Worthington asks his friend to seek out "Moseley's widow," who, he hears, saved her books from the great fire and is keeping a shop in London. He asks for two copies of the second edition, promising to return one, "with the printed poems corrected by the author's original copy, and also with the addition of other poems of his, written with his own hand, and not yet printed." Moseley was the printer of both the 1646 and 1648 editions, to the latter of which Worthington evidently refers. The entry is of interest because it adds an important item to the few which Mr. Martin has been able to cite prior to Lloyd's *Memoires* in 1668, and also because it indicates the survival, at least until the date of the letter, of a copy of the poems corrected

by Crashaw himself. Were these corrections made at the time when Crashaw is supposed to have returned to Oxford for a brief time before his final exile? And is the MS. of which Worthington speaks one of those cited by Mr. Martin, or one thus far unknown?

EDWIN GREENLAW.

Falstaff and Other Shakespearean Topics. By ALBERT H. TOLMAN.
New York, Macmillan, 1925. Pp. xii + 270. \$2.50.

Professor Tolman has here brought together a valuable collection of seventeen papers on various Shakespearean topics; of these nine have already been printed.

Why did Shakespeare Create Falstaff? Professor Tolman's answer, cogently put, is that it was not merely for fun but as a necessary and vital part of the play, "a structural necessity."

The question Is Shakespeare Aristocratic? is an important one. Did Shakespeare appreciate the worth of the individual man, or did the intellectual and moral backwardness of the masses repel him? Did he foresee that the Protestant claim of the right of the individual to exercise his private judgment in religion was bound to improve the quality of private judgments in all departments of life? Did he see that Puritan excesses were bound to correct themselves in time? Or was he blinded like millions of others by the gloomy theology which has ridden the world of Christendom like an octopus for so many generations, and which has done its full share in preventing us from understanding the true nature of man?

It will hardly do to attach much importance to Shakespeare's view of the Roman populace in *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus* as fickle and cowardly. Shakespeare is thinking of the mob, and the mob is never anything else than fickle and cowardly. On the other hand, there is one thing certain: Shakespeare was not Man Omniscent, and it is no discredit to him if he failed to understand men or perchance to perceive the advance of the democratic spirit. We must remember, too, that in Shakespeare's time the doctrine of the divine right of kings was almost universally accepted, especially by the kings themselves. So when Polixenes says of Perdita, the supposed shepherd's daughter,

Nothing she does or seems
But smacks of something greater than herself,
Too noble for this place,

he is simply giving expression to a belief in this doctrine; and we can hardly follow Professor Tolman in thinking that there may be "something of courtier-like servility in this extreme glorification of kingly blood" (p. 26).

On the whole we must agree with Tolman and those he quotes that Shakespeare's sympathies were naturally with the queen and court. Under Elizabeth he had no great reason for other feelings. It is true that in general he appreciates the worth of the common man, if Tolman's inferences in Section 3 (pp. 33-40) are right (and we think they are). All of which goes to show that Shakespeare is universal. There are both good kings and nobles and bad commoners, and we have no right to judge the kingly class in the plays by the worst specimens if we are to judge the commoners by the best of them.

Shakespeare's toppers form another interesting study. Shakespeare was of an age when everybody drank and many drank to excess. Yet there are many passages which may be fairly construed as furnishing a condemnation of excessive drinking; and Tolman produces an impressive argument.

In *The Epic Character of Henry the Fifth* the author dwells on the dramatic deficiencies of the play and its epic purpose and effect. Let us admit that history, which Shakespeare was here writing in play-form, is not always dramatic in any great measure, but sometimes displays rather epic proportions and tendencies.

A highly instructive study is Shakespeare's Manipulation of his Sources in *As You Like It*. Is it true that Jaques is quite the superfluity that one might infer from the words "he really does nothing in the play" (p. 72)? For that matter, who else does much? *As You Like It* is a sylvan picture, and not much in the way of a drama. On the side of his discontent Jaques is a foil for the Duke. On the side of his melancholy he is a study in sentimentalism, introduced perhaps for the sake of variety, but more probably that his artificial sentiment may contrast with the Duke's genuine feeling for the woodland. He is not so much melancholy as in love with the idea of being melancholy. He is thus akin to the Duke in *Twelfth Night*, who is in love with believing himself to be in love.

Discussing the rank of *King Lear* among Shakespeare's plays and the great pieces of world literature, Professor Tolman is moderate. It is hard to judge and perhaps no one person is qualified to give a final judgment.

A short chapter has to do with the choosing of the caskets in *The Merchant of Venice*. How seriously shall we take the meditation of each suitor on the legend of the casket which attracts him? Suffice it to say that each reveals exactly his inner nature in his comment. When Bassanio's turn comes, it is likely, as Tolman suggests, that Bassanio takes this turn of thought about the appearances of things as a result of the singing of the song which Portia orders. But does she stop with merely suggesting this line of thought? To make assurance doubly sure, as I have elsewhere

pointed out, she apparently suggests by the rime the idea of lead. As for a prolonged exposition of the essential nature of true marriage, which Tolman fails to find here (p. 120), would it have added to the joyfulness of the play?

There are illuminating studies of *Julius Caesar*. Regarding the boastful Caesar, we do not think the grandiloquent language put into Caesar's mouth should be taken necessarily as an artistic mistake. As Tolman says, "the popular mind cannot easily conceive of great power without the accompaniment of grandiloquent speech."

But enough; lack of space forbids us to proceed further. Professor Tolman is an ideal critic—thoughtful, sane, judicious. He has contributed measurably to the soundest Shakespearean criticism of our time.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs. Collected by the Late GAVIN GREIG. Edited with an introductory essay, collation, and notes by ALEXANDER KEITH. University of Aberdeen Studies, No. 100. 1925. xlv+320 pages.

In view of its importance this volume of traditional ballads and ballad airs deserves more attention from American scholars than it has yet received. It is ably edited by Alexander Keith, who contributes an introductory essay on Traditional Ballads and Ballad-Collecting in Aberdeenshire. It will be recalled that the place of honor in the Child *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (or the first text of 91 out of 305 ballads) is allotted to Aberdeenshire versions. Mrs. Brown of Falkland, Scott's "Old Lady's Collection," numerous Aberdeenshire ballad books like Laing's, Sharpe's, Maidment's, Buchan's, Kinloch's, Motherwell's, Robertson's, and unprinted Aberdeenshire MSS., all lend support to Child's remark: "That the best Scottish ballads are from the north there can be no doubt." The habit of ballad-singing has been especially persistent in Aberdeenshire. Greig has relied for the bulk of his collection upon comparatively few singers or reciters, having unusually retentive memories, who come from a few special families. His material derives from Aberdeenshire residents whose grandparents lived in the days of the famous collectors. The grandmother of one of his singers must have learned her texts in the concluding decades of the eighteenth century. Plainly here is a collection that has more than ordinary interest and value.

It is its vindication of Peter Buchan as a comparatively authentic editor and collector that first challenges the attention of readers

of the Greig-Keith volume. The discoveries and researches of Greig and the conclusions of William Walker ("Peter Buchan and Other Papers," 1915) go far to dispel the cloud upon Buchan's name and the suspicion resting upon his texts. The case against him is re-examined in the introductory essay, and his editorial methods compared with Percy's and Scott's and Jamieson's. While it is admitted that he "edited" and pieced together, like other respectable editors of the period, it is the conviction of Greig and Keith that Buchan was comparatively reliable. His editorial delinquencies are no greater than Scott's and though he made certain errors of judgment, he should no longer be traduced as in the past. Of Buchan's James Rankin it is pointed out that there is no proof that Rankin ever composed verses himself. He was a folk singer and no more, a blind beggar with a retentive memory, singing the songs of the countryside. Texts repeated by folk singers today, not touched into poetry by cultured people like Scott or Mrs. Brown of Falkland, are as garrulous, diffuse, and flat in quality as Rankin's. The Aberdeenshire versions recovered by Greig, when examined as evidence for or against Buchan's trustworthiness (in instances, too, where direct derivation from Buchan's texts are out of the question), give testimony favorable to him and to Rankin's versions.

Greig's collection makes available texts of 108 ballads included in the Child collection. When compared with the Child texts they show the inevitable crossings, amalgamations, and intrusions, to be expected after the lapse of time. But they make, without question, a valuable body of traditional material, to be taken into account henceforth by devotees of the cult of English and Scottish folk-song.

LOUISE POUND.

University of Nebraska.

The Realm of Literature. By HENRY W. WELLS. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1927. Pp. vii + 182.

The world would have been no poorer had Mr. Wells seen fit not to attempt an aesthetic interpretation of literature. For his interpretation is confused by untenable notions of the nature of what he calls "art" and of psychology. His notion of art is confused by the fact like most aestheticians he fails to distinguish between art from the point of view of the artist and art from the point of view of the observer: there is obviously no saying that what an observer gets out of looking at a picture is or should be what an artist gets out of making it. In the second place he forgets or overlooks the equally obvious fact that anything can be

an art: arts are of things, not just unqualified arts. Thus there is an art of making telephone directories, of writing advertisements, even of writing doctoral dissertations or of living, which in their nature are not very different from the art—as distinguished from the business—of making sonnets.

This is not the place to discuss Mr. Wells's psychological theories. He is apparently one of those writers who still think that psychology is something to be performed by anyone who chooses. I wonder if he would treat physics and chemistry in the same way. He roughly divides consciousness into a waking and a sleeping state and defines one kind of art as that which arises in a state emerging from sleep—classic art—and one kind as that which arises in a state sinking into sleep—romantic art. This is a very pretty picture but exactly what fact does it denote? It is true that *The Dream of the Rood* is "saturated in the spirit of dreams" (Mr. Wells's metaphor); but does that mean that its author was falling asleep as he wrote it? So too the *Canterbury Tales* are simple and clear; but was their author any more wide awake than the author of *Dream of the Rood*? After all one has to keep his wits about him to write anything, let alone an intricate poem. But Mr. Wells believes that "art as we understand it would cease to exist in a primarily rationalistic world." What is there non-rational or irrational about people like Leonardo da Vinci, or for that matter any architect however unpretentious? Can one imagine the builders of Chartres stumbling about in a mean state between dreaming and waking?

It would serve no good purpose to expose here all the absurdities of this book. But it would be extremely useful for a teacher to go through it page by page and point them out to his students. For Mr. Wells makes all the mistakes which most of us would have made had publication been as easy in our youth as it is to-day. His great sin is the substituting of pretty language for logical analysis coupled with too great a willingness to enter fields in which his knowledge is inadequate.

I cannot close this review without a word of protest against such occasional vulgarity as appears on page 31: "Mr. Paul Elmer More and Professor Irving Babbitt (most learnedly illiterate gentlemen!). . . ." This from a man who on the preceding page says that the Athenian sophists represent a decadence in philosophy. Sometimes this sort of superciliousness becomes downright funny, as in the remarks on Quiller-Couch on page 153 and on Mr. Lowes on page 160. Such things may be accidental but they scarcely add to the seriousness of a book.

GEORGE BOAS.

The Johns Hopkins University.

The Calculus of Variants, an Essay on Textual Criticism. By W. W. GREG. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1927. Pp. vii + 63. \$2.50.

Perhaps the first thing that should be said about Mr. Greg's book is that it is nothing like so formidable as its title. Not that one will find it very easy reading, however; for into its sixty-odd pages is packed a great deal of close logical analysis. To understand it one must have some knowledge of the processes of textual criticism; it is not a manual for beginners. But there is no need that one should have mastered the higher mathematics. A very elementary smattering of school algebra is the book's utmost demand. It is not, properly speaking, mathematical at all.

One suspects that the forbidding title is merely the author's little joke; for he himself reassures us in his preface:

"I wish at the outset to make it clear that there is nothing esoteric or mysterious about my so-called Calculus: it aims at nothing but defining and making precise for formal use the logical rules which textual critics have always applied. It is quite incapable of producing any results that could not have been attained by the traditional methods; only it aims at achieving them with less labour and greater certainty."

The essay deals almost exclusively with a single aspect of textual criticism, the affiliation of manuscripts, the preliminary problem of determining on the basis of variant readings the genealogical relationship subsisting between the extant manuscripts of a given document. It is in this part of his work that the textual critic has most need of straight, logical thinking. Mr. Greg proposes no new principles; but he applies to the accepted method a rigorous definition of the various concepts concerned and an acute, logical analysis of the several processes.

The only novelty of the essay lies in the very ingenious devices of symbolical notation which it proposes, and which give to its pages the superficial look of a mathematical treatise. When one has mastered the notation—and it is much less difficult than it looks—one can record with a minimum of effort a complicated genealogical relation in a formula rather than in a diagram of diverging lines. And one can record the variant readings of a given line in such a fashion as to make more readily perspicuous the genealogical influences to which the divergent readings logically point.

Throughout the essay the author has, for purposes of illustration, assumed an imaginary case where a document is preserved in six extant manuscripts.¹ Where the number of manuscripts to be

¹ Mr. Greg, already well known to students of the early drama as general editor of the Malone Society, states in his preface that his "Calculus" grew out of an attempt to determine the relation of the

dealt with is not much greater than this, the proposed notation might well prove very useful. But, while it is theoretically applicable to any number of manuscripts, I suspect that the formulas resulting from the attempt to apply it to a case which involved as many as twenty manuscripts would become so bewildering as to defeat their object.

Scholars who are concerned with textual criticism should not fail to read this essay. It will be sure to clarify their thinking, and may save them from certain errors which editors have not always escaped. Even though one may not adopt in its entirety the proposed notation, one might well find many aspects of it highly useful.

ROBERT K. ROOT.

Princeton University.

BRIEF MENTION

Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée françaises contemporaines, 1870-1925. Par DANIEL MORNET. Paris, Larousse, 1927. 263 pp. M. Mornet has undertaken the difficult task of judging his contemporaries. He discusses all important men of letters whose literary center of gravity falls after 1870 and outlines the general movement of ideas both as to content and to form. Minor writers are treated in finer print at the end of each chapter. Only the most representative literary works are mentioned and the most essential books of reference. By thus economizing space M. is able to treat several hundred writers and even to add a brief chapter on *la Critique historique et la Philologie*, in which he lists many of his colleagues at the Sorbonne and elsewhere. Doubtless anyone well-read in the period could find objections to the distribution of the material, to the slighting of certain authors, to the inclusion of certain French scholars at the expense of others, but such criticism is unavoidable and negligible. M. aims to be neither erudite nor complete, but useful to students and their guides. And in this he succeeds, for his sketches give the essential characteristics of the authors under discussion, his point of view is eminently just, his presentation concise, vigorous, and interesting. In short the book constitutes an admirable introduction to the study of contemporary French letters.

H. C. L.

manuscripts of the Chester Plays, while he was engaged on a forthcoming edition of the pageant of Antichrist in that cycle. It may be noted that the number of extant manuscripts of the whole of the Chester cycle is just six.

Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival. I. Teil: Die jüngeren *G-Handschriften. 1. Abteilung: Die Wiener Mischhandschriftengruppe *W (Gⁿ G^s G^u G^o). Von EDUARD HARTL [Germanisch und Deutsch, Studien zur Sprache und Kultur, 1. Hft.] Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1928. xxiii, 164 pp. The unusual abundance of *Parzival* MSS. has hitherto been a bar to a really comprehensive study of Wolfram's text. Lachmann divided the witnesses into the two groups D and G, and let it go at that. But Dr. Hartl now shows that the relation of the various groups of MSS. is much more complicated, whilst at the same time Lachmann's chief representative of the authoritative D group has idiosyncrasies of its own, which are not characteristic of the group as a whole. As the first fruits of his long and laborious studies, the author presents a detailed and convincing comparison of a subgroup of late MSS. belonging to the G class. The results here shown are not limited to the classification of the several MSS. of the group selected, but include also a chapter on the origin of the several groups (pp. 144-163). We welcome this most important contribution to the study of *Parzival*, and look forward with interest to the publication of the next instalment of this monumental undertaking.

W. K.

La figure de Saül et sa représentation dans la littérature dramatique française. Par M. A. THIEL. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1926. 138 pp. Dr. T. shows that the most dramatic figure in Old Testament annals has been represented on the French stage as a rebel chastized by God and as a victim either of his own peculiar characteristics or of priestcraft and his rival's ambition. The first point of view is expressed chiefly by La Taille and other early writers. Du Ryer differs from them by giving to his hero a more appealing character, influenced by christian stoicism. Voltaire uses Saul chiefly to emphasize the iniquity of priests. The Prince de Ligne, Millevoie, and Lamartine follow Alfieri in making him his own victim. Gide differs from them in his diagnosis of Saul's malady, which he attributes to sexual perversion. Dr. T. studies not only the plays by these authors, but a number of others. Indeed, with the exception of Duché de Vancy's *Jonathas*, he seems to have examined all the plays of any consequence in which the character appears. The investigation has been conducted intelligently and the conclusions in regard to the various authors and the theme as a whole are presented in an interesting manner.

H. C. L.

Lady Miller and the Batheaston Literary Circle. By RUTH AVALINE HESSELGRAVE. Yale University Press, 1927. xii + 93 pp. \$2.00. Unlike most American studies, this pleasantly-written, dainty volume is more learned than it appears to be and deals with a subject more important than the author claims it to be. For, inane as are most of the poems discussed, they form part of a wide-spread movement in the late eighteenth-century to which little attention has been paid, although it possesses the unusual interest of revealing the disintegration of neo-classicism unaccompanied by any strong tendency towards things usually termed "romantic." Miss Hesselgrave seems to have overlooked (although in the lamentable absence of an index one cannot be sure) the poems dealing with the Batheaston vase printed in the *Universal Magazine*, the *Monthly Review*, and the *Critical Review*, as well as a number of separately-published pieces, including one by William Meyler whom she mentions. "Sir John More," spoken of on p. 78, should be, according to the *D. N. B.*, "Sir John Henry Moore."

R. D. H.

Das Oxford Book Deutscher Dichtung vom 12ten bis zum 20sten Jahrhundert, herausgegeben von H. G. FIEDLER. Oxford, Universitätsverlag 1927. The Oxford Book of German Verse has been re-issued with an addition of 48 poems, nine of which bear the name of Stefan George and eight that of Rainer Maria Rilke. The selection shows the same judicious hand and unerring taste which made this anthology our best and most representative collection. Yet the reviewer regrets the omission of such authors as Wilhelm von Scholz, Ina Seidel and Ernst Lissauer (who has eight volumes of verse to his credit). Hofmannsthal's 'Terzinen' and 'Ballade des äusseren Lebens' might have been added, since they have stood the test of the last thirty years, so has Beer-Hofmann's 'Schlaflied für Mirjam.' If with one exception (Lersch) poems of the World War have been omitted, Hermann Hesse's

Jeder hat's gehabt,
Keiner hat's geschätzt,
Jeden hat der süsse Quell gelabt,
O wie klingt der Name Friede jetzt!

would have adorned this volume with the name of a valient champion for international understanding as well as of a poet of the older generation (born in 1877) who marches on with the young. But these strictures are not to detract from the hearty welcome which we must accord the book.

E. F.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

MAY, 1928

Number 5

HEYWOOD AND THE POPULARIZING OF HISTORY

Among the Elizabethans, Thomas Heywood stands out in his effort to make literature easily understood by the commonality of readers. In him there is no despising of the intelligence of the bourgeoisie. In his serious productions he seeks to provide such explanatory equipment as will make clear all obscurities or difficult allusions. All of this he does without condescension, in a frank attempt to make enlightenment easy. Nowhere is Heywood's endeavor to popularize knowledge more apparent than in his historical and historical-biographical works. These publications he regarded as important to his literary reputation. Because he did not take sufficiently into account these very works, Mr. A. M. Clark¹ maintains that Heywood as a man of letters was "willing to trim his sails to any wind." Without repeating matter already touched upon by Mr. Clark, I wish to point out that Hey-

¹ "Thomas Heywood as a Critic," *MLN.*, xxxvii (1922), 217-223. Mr. Clark confines the bulk of his consideration to a comparison of Heywood's dramatic theory with his actual practice. He maintains that Heywood was an orthodox Sidneyean in theory, but that he regarded his plays as hack-work to which the rules did not apply.

Primarily a man of the theatre, Heywood wrote his plays as a practical dramatist, and did not, to be sure, regard them as works of literary art. That he regarded them as hack-work, as Mr. Clark insists, is to misinterpret the dramatist. As a commercial playwright, he did as the other dramatists of the day, even grumbling Ben Jonson: provided what public taste demanded. He looked upon his plays not as hack-work, but simply as belonging to another category from the productions which he himself regarded as literature.

wood worked as a serious literary craftsman with definite ideals of method and purpose, a fact which Mr. Clark seems unwilling to acknowledge. Like Shakespeare, Heywood looked upon his non-dramatic work as the source of his claim to be a man of letters. It is in the non-dramatic publications, largely overlooked by Mr. Clark, that one must seek his literary creed. In this discussion I shall be principally concerned with Heywood's ideals of writing as applied chiefly to his historical and biographical material.

In historical matter Heywood had a fundamental interest. He was cognizant of the value of history for its patriotic teaching and wished to present it in a brief and accurate form for the benefit of the general public. For him even traditional history had its nationalistic value: in *Troia Britanica or Great Brittaines Troy* (1609) he traces anew the legend of Troynovant but mingles with it allusions to Henry V, Sir Richard Grenville, Drake, Frobisher, Hawkins, and other heroes. His *Life of Merlin* (1641) simply uses the old story of Merlin and his prophecies to present a chronological account of all the kings of Britain in such a fashion as to provide a popular compendium of British history.

Heywood anticipates modern makers of handbooks in the *Life of Merlin*. One of his literary goals, evident over and over, is the popularization of knowledge, especially historical knowledge. In the "Address to the Reader" of this work, the writer announces that he has made a convenient handbook for those who wish to be informed "in the knowledge of our English Annalls":

For in the steed of a large study book, and huge voluminous Tractate, able to take up a whole yeare in reading, and to load and tyre a Porter in carrying, thou hast here a small Manuell, containing all the pith and marrow of the greater, made portable for thee (if thou so please) to beare in the pocket, so that thou mayst say, that in this small compendium or abstract, thou has Holinshed, Polychronicon, Fabian, Speed, or any of the rest, of more Giantlike bulke or binding.

The narrative is straight-forward and unprejudiced even in the treatment of religious controversy.

In *The Exemplary Lives and memorable Acts of nine the most worthy Women of the World* (1640) Heywood had*previously produced a pocket edition. He announced that "though I could

produce infinites to make this pocket booke rather voluminous then portable, let these nine serve to vindicate the entire number." The value of compression had manifested itself long before in the *Gunaikeion* (1624). As lengthy as this old history of women appears to a modern reader, it is a carefully condensed compendium of innumerable female biographies. In the address to the reader the author makes an explanation of the value of condensation:

Now if any aske, Why I have shut vp and contruded within a narrow roome, many large Histories, not delating them with euerie circumstance? I answer, That therein I have imitated Aelianus de Var. Hist. and Valer. Maxim. who epitomized great and memorable acts, reducing and contracting into a compendious Method wide and loose Histories, giuing them notwithstanding their full weight, in a few words.

He also wishes to make his biographies readable; hence,

I have not introduced them in order, neither Alphabetically, nor according to custome or president; which I thus excuse: The most cunning and curious Musick, is that which is made out of discords.

In imitation of the dramatic writers is the insertion of humorous material, "fabulous Jeasts and Tales."

As a writer in touch with the busy middle-class of his day, Heywood realized that the voluminousness of the chronicles was a deterrent to the popular reading of history. For this reason in the address "To the two-fold Readers" of *Troia Britanica* is a promise of brevity:

I have taskt myselfe to such succinctnesse and brevity, that in the iudiciall perusall of these few Cantons (with the Scolies annexed) as little time shall bee hazzarded, as profite from them be anyway expected.

With a scholar's realization of his limitations, Heywood apologizes for his lack of accuracy in the early legends reprinted in *Troia Britanica* and pathetically acknowledges the impossibility of treating fairly or accurately contemporary history. He warns his readers that he does not propose to hale in a confusion of histories of all nations but to provide

a briefe Index, or short Register, (to comprize many and the most noted things) and to conferre their times with our history of England: . . . onely thus much let me speake in my owne behalfe: with Ages past I have been too little acquainted, and this age present, I dare not bee too bold.

Heywood is modern ² in his feeling that fact ought to be reported faithfully without the coloring of personal bias. He is careful to reproduce even fictional matter as the stories have been handed down without the intrusion of personal opinion. In the *Gunai-keion* ³ he says of his method: "I answer to all in generall, I have only specified such things as I have read, and for my own opinion I keep it reserved."

An effort at attaining to some conception of a philosophy of history is evident in Heywood's works. However far he may have missed the modern historian's point of view in practice, in theory he was feeling toward unbiased and accurate historical account. It is significant that Heywood chose to precede his translation of Sallust's *Catiline* (1608) with a translation of Bodin's *Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem*, entitling it, "Of the Choise of History, by way of Preface, dedicated to the courteous Reader, vpon occasion of the frequent Translations of these latter times." Undoubtedly Bodin summed up Heywood's own conceptions of the historical method.

In one of his last works, *The Exemplary Lives*, etc., he presents a brief essay on history in an epistle to the reader. Since the work is rather inaccessible, quotation in full of the significant portions of the epistle may be worth while:

... History in generall, is either Nugatory as in all comicall Drammaes; or adhortatory, as in the Fables of Aesop, Poggius, &c. or fictionary, as in poetick narrations; or Relatory, such as soly adheare to truth without deviation or digression; of which onely the ancient Gramarions ad-

² One finds the germ of a modern biographical method in Heywood's *Englands Elisabeth* (1631) in which he presents the early life and the influences upon Elizabeth during her minority which made for greatness as a queen:

"The prosperous and successefull reigne of this Royall Queen and Virgin hath been largely delivered in the Latine tongue, whereby all forein Nations have been made partakers of her admirable vertues and religious government But for that part of her life, during her tender and sappy age, all our domestick remembrancers have been sparing to speak.

"As they have shewed you a Queen, I expose to your view a Princesse: they in her Majestie, I in her minority: they from the scepter to the sepulchre, as she was a Sovereigne; I the processe of her time from the cradle to the Crown, as she was a sad and sorrowfull subject."

³ 1657 ed., p. 301.

mitted, as worthy the name, and in which ranke I intreate thee to receive this following tractate.

Of History there be foure species, either taken from place, as Geography; from time, as Chronologie; from Generation as Genealogie; or from gests really done, which (not altogether unproperly) may be called Annologie: The Elements of which it consisteth are Person, place, time, manner, instrument, matter, and thing. . .

Simon Grinaeus speaking of the utilitie that ariseth unto us from the reading of History hath words to this purpose, What can be thought more pleasing or profitable then in this spacious Theater of humane life, for a man to instruct his understanding, by searching to know whatsoeuer is marvelously carried in all the parts thereof? To view the danger to others without any perill to himselfe, thereby to make him the more wise and cautelous? to make happy use of forreigne presidents and examples by applying them to his owne perticulars? to be as it were private with the greatest men, in their gravest counsellis, and not onely privie to the purpose, but partaker of the event? To be acquainted with all the passages of state, the qualitie of times, the succession of Ages the vicissitude of both? The situation of countries, the original of nations? the rare liues of good Princes, the lamentable ends of Cruell Tirants? To make all that hath beene precedent, as familiar with us as the present, forreigne lands as well knowne unto us as that wherein we live: The arts of our forefathers as visible unto our eyes as were they now in being: As ours (if we shall doe ought worthy remembrance) commended to all the posteritie: briefly such is the benefit of History, that comparing what is past with the present, we may better prepare ourselves for the future.

Further to the exact composure of History, there belongs such an accurate curiositie, that whosoever shall attaine to the true method and manner, may boast he hath transcended Herodotus, Xipheline, Dio, Troguus Pompeius, Justine, Livy, Curtius, Tacitus, Swetonius, and even Caesar in his Commentaries: To all which I must ingeniously confess I am so many degrees inferiour that I dare not list myself in the number of the Historygraphers being now rather a remembrancer or collector of some passages concerning the persons now in agitation.

One should observe the stress put upon the utilitarian purpose of history in the education of the citizen and servant of the state. In the dedication of *Catiline* to Sir Thomas Somerset, Heywood announces that the history is "for the pleasure of your vacant howers, *but especially for the generall good of all English Gentlemen*" (italics mine). This conception of history as a cultural agent in English education recurs in the *Gunaikeion*.⁴

⁴ Bk. 3, p. 162.

But the purpose of my tractate, is to exemplify, not to instruct; to shew you presidents of vertue from others, not to fashion any new imaginary form from my selves.

He continues to emphasize that he sets forth all types of female biography in the hope that women may find some good to imitate and thus "every of you fashion her selfe as compleat a woman for vertue, as Apelles made up the pourtraiture of his goddesse for beauty." One of the chief values of plays, Heywood maintains in *The Apology for Actors* (1612) is their teaching of history.⁵

Since history does have such a value in the education of an Englishman, Heywood is greatly concerned with making historical matter easily accessible to the generality of readers. Further than this, he is a foe to obscurantism and seeks to present his material clearly and understandably. Always he is imbued with the sincere desire to popularize learning. Lest all of it be not clearly understood, Heywood appends explanatory notes at the end of each canto of *Troia Britanica*. At the end of the first canto he explains:

Our Poem, though familiarly knowne to them of iudgment and reading, yet because it may not seeme intricate to the lesse capeable, I thought it not altogether impertinent to insert some few observations to the ende of every Canto.

In a projected edition of his *Age* plays, the authors promised historical notes of explanation:⁶

If the three former Ages (now out of Print,) bee added to these (as I am promised) to make vp an handsome Volumne; I purpose (Deo Assis-tente,) to illustrate the whole Worke, with an Explanation of all the difficulties, and an Historicall Comment of every hard name, which may appeare obscure or intricate to such as are not frequent in Poetry.

⁵ J. P. Collier's reprint, *Shakespeare Society* (1841), pp. 52-53: "... and what man have you now of that weake capacity that cannot discourse of any notable thing recorded even from William the Conqueror, nay, from the landing of Brute, untill this day? beeing possest of their true use, for or because playes are writ with this ayme, and carryed with this methode, to teach their subjects obedience to their king, to shew the people the untimely ends of such as have moved tumults, commotions, and insurrections, to present them with the flourishing estate of such as live in obedience, exhorting them to allegiance, dehorting them from all trayterous and fellonious stratagems."

⁶ Epistle to the Reader, *The Iron Age*, Pt. 2.

A similar expression of a desire to make his work understood by all comes in the *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells* (1635).⁷

Heywood makes a final and conclusive declaration for clarity in *Londini Status Pacatus* (1639) in which he states: "... in all my writing I labour to avoyd what is abstruse or obsolete." No tortured allegory or obscure reference is this man's goal. Though in practice he may fall short of his ideal, in theory he is an apostle of simplicity⁸ and conciseness in an age not much concerned over making its literary output easily intelligible to the populace.

The Johns Hopkins University.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

⁷ Bk. 1, p. 31: "That nothing in these short Tractates may appeare difficult to the Ignorant, I hold it necessarie vnto my present purpose, (as willing to be vnderstood by all) to illustrate whatsoeuer may seem obscure, as well by Precept as Historie. Which though the Learned may passe ouer, as things to them familiar and well knowne: yet vnto others, (neither frequent in reading nor well travelled in language;) no doubt but some of our marginal Annotations, with other particular Observations, may in their carefull perusall benefit such as reade not onely for fashion, but vse, and make it not their pastime but their profit. For that was the end to which Industrious Authors first aimed their Indevours, and spent so much Inke and Oile," etc.

For further references to Heywood's desire to popularize knowledge, see my "Thomas Heywood: Spokesman of Middle-Class Ethics," forthcoming in *Studies in Philology*.

⁸ The plain-spoken Heywood, as much as he respects Latin, has no use for a display of pedantry. In the *Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (Act 4, Sc. 1) Taber says of Boniface and Sencer: "Nay sir, there are two Schollers, and they are spowting Latin one against the other; and in my simple Iudgement the stranger is the better Scholler, and is somewhat too hard for sir Boniface: For he speakes lowder, and that you know is euer the sign of the most learning."

Affectation in poetry he satirizes in *Loves Maistresse* (Act 1, Sc. 1):

... doe wee not daily see

Euery dull-witted Asse spit Poetrie.

Cf. also the satire of love poetry and the pastoral, Act 2, Sc. 1. In the *Fair Maid of Ewchange* (if this is Heywood's) Frank says of Anthony Golding:

He hath perus'd all the impressions

Of Sonnets since the Fall of Lucifer

And made some scurvy quaint collection

Of fustian phrases, and uplandish words. . . .

(Pearson reprint, vol. II, p. 39).

SIR THOMAS MORE'S VIEW OF DRAMA

What Sir Thomas More, the friend of Erasmus, thought of the drama would be easier to surmise than we imagine, if we were obliged to adopt that course. What the portrayer of Richard III and of those realistic characters who come alive in his driest controversial treatises might have done had he ever turned his lively dramatic talent to the stage is as hard to predict as it is fascinating to imagine. But we may say that we know the view of drama which Sir Thomas More held, for a passage in his *Utopia* crystallizes our natural conjecture that he took the classic view. While the Miracle-Play, Morality, and Interlude were preparing the native soil which, with classical fertilization, was to produce Elizabethan drama, More set down the view which was to challenge that romantic drama in the classic bias of Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke and in dramatic activity as late as Thomas Kyd and Samuel Daniel.

More's view comes to us in "a fine and fitte similitude" which is incidental to the main thought of his *Utopia*. Near the close of Book I, Master Raphael and Master More are discussing whether philosophy has any place among kings. Master More admits that "this school philosophy hath not" and then qualifies his admission with the similitude. Imagination will serve us if we think of him as speaking to Shakspeare nearly a hundred years later: "But there is another philosophy more civil, which knoweth, as ye would say, her own stage, and thereafter ordering and behaving herself in the play that she hath in hand, playeth her part accordingly with comeliness, uttering nothing out of due order and fashion. And this is the philosophy that you must use. Or else whiles a comedy of Plautus is playing, and the vile bondmen scoffing and trifling among themselves, if you should suddenly come upon the stage in a philosopher's apparel, and rehearse out of Octavia the place wherein Seneca disputeth with Nero: had it not been better for you to have played the dumb person, than by rehearsing that, which served neither for the time nor place, to have made such a tragical comedy or gallimaufry? For by bringing in other stuff that nothing appertaineth to the present matter, you must needs mar and pervert the play that is in hand, though

the stuff that you bring be much better." This is the philosophy of the stage which Shakspeare and Elizabethan drama did not use, but which Thomas More would probably have used; unless, like Shakspeare, he had learned from the pit that "the stuff that you bring be much better." At any rate, this represents his view of drama, for it comes with the authority of "a fine and fitte similitude" which had to be as self-evident and true to him as the point he wished to make; he could not hazard his argument upon less.

Interesting as it is to know that this was the view of Sir Thomas More, it is of greater consequence to understand what this means in the history of literary criticism. Not only does this similitude anticipate Sidney's statement of the unities and decorum in his *Apology for Poetrie*, but it antedates Castelvetro's formulation of the dramatic unities by more than fifty years. More's statement is definite on the unity of action and non-mixture of the *genres*, and suggestive of the idea of decorum. To mix comedy and tragedy or to introduce matter not of a piece with the action is, in his view, to mar and pervert the play in hand. Related to this opinion is the general suggestion of decorum in the philosophy which, knowing her stage, "playeth her part accordingly with comeliness, uttering nothing out of due order and fashion." The philosophy in this passage suggests the humanistic relation of decorum to the conduct or courtesy books. *Comeliness*, though English for More's Latin, is perhaps a better word for decorum than the later *decency*. Even in its English translation More's statement is nearly a quarter of a century earlier than Castelvetro's, which preceded Sydney's. And Vida's inkling of decorum did not come till the publication of his *Poelics* in 1527, whereas the *Utopia* appeared in 1516. The presence in More's *Utopia* of partial anticipations of neo-classical doctrines is a further witness to the inquiring mind of this charming humanist and an interesting footnote to the history of literary criticism.

The worth of More's similitude as evidence of his view of the drama is increased by the signs of thinking on the subject of the theatre which it reveals. He knew, and doubtless had seen, Plautus and Seneca; and we must remember that John Heywood was his friend. In fact, More was probably writing as a critical observer of what he had seen in the drama of his time; the extravagances

which religious acrimony prompted on the contemporary stage evidently offended his esthetic taste more than his religious sense.

Prophetic of neo-classical criticism, this passage gives us a momentary vision of More's view of the drama and makes his *Utopia* even more "the true prologue of the Renaissance." But More does not forget a very English concession, "though the stuff that you bring be much better," which gives the devil his due and will let Shakspeare and Elizabethan drama into imperfect glory when they come short of classical unity.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON.

Stanford University.

GEORGE GASCOIGNE AND THE SIEGE OF FAMAGUSTA

On the occasion of the double marriage of the son and daughter of Anthony Brown, first Viscount Mountacute, George Gascoigne was invited to provide a masque. Eight gentlemen, friends of the Viscount, had gone so far as to buy the materials for their costumes, and to have them cut after the Venetian fashion. Having reached that stage of preparation, they appealed to Gascoigne to devise a masque which should make those costumes appropriate. The versatile poet, in complying, made happy use of a contemporary incident. On August 15, 1571, Famagusta, in Italian possession, had fallen before a determined and bloody assault of the Turks under Mustapha Bashaw. A Venetian, Count Nestore Martinengo, had been present at the siege and had written a lurid, though prejudiced, account of it, which was published at Verona in 1572 under the title of *L'Assedio et presa di Famagosta*.¹ In that same year the pamphlet was translated into English by William Malim, headmaster successively of Eton and St. Paul's. The title page reads, *The true Report of all the successe of Famagosta, of the antique writers called Tamassus, a Citie in Cyprus. In the which the whole order of all the skirmishes, batteries, mines, and assaultes geven to the sayd Fortresse, may plainly appeare. . . . Englished out of Italian by William Malim. . . . Imprinted at London by John Daye. An. 1572.* It is a thin quarto of only sixteen folios,

¹ The book was translated into French in the same year. The German translation bears neither date nor place of publication.

with a lengthy dedication to the Earl of Leicester followed by a brief description of the Island of Cyprus.

This book must have come into Gascoigne's hands because he incorporates parts of it in his *Maske for the Viscount Mountacute*.² His devise consists in having a fictitious relative of the Mountacutes return from the siege of Famagusta where his roving father had been killed and where he himself, taken captive by the Turks, had been liberated by a group of noble Venetians, happily Mountacutes also, who had escorted him to his native England. The boy then appeared with his rescuers at the double wedding, and recounted what he, an eye witness, had experienced at Famagusta. As Martinengo was likewise an eye witness, Gascoigne lets the two careers run in several respects parallel. After describing the city's fall, young Mounthermer-Mountacute goes on:

I styll a slave remaind.
To one, which Prelybassa hight. (p. 80.)

Martinengo says:

I offered, and gave my selfe slave to one Sangaccho del Bir.
(fol. 13v.)³

Set free by the noble Venetians, the boy exclaims:

To thinke what joye then pierst my heart, and how I thought me blest.
To see that cruell Turke which held me as his slave,
By happie hand of Christians, his paiment thus to have. (p. 81.)

And Malim, in his dedication:

The late blowes, which the Turkes have receaved since this their fury, in
token of Gods wrath against them, much comforteth every Christian hart.
(fol. A ivv.)

Near the end of his dramatic story the youth says:

I was in sackcloth I, nowe am I cladde in Golde,
And weare such roabes, as I my selfe take pleasure to beholde. (p. 83.)

² A devise of a *Maske for the right honorable Viscount Mountacute*. Published originally in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, London, 1573. Republished in *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne* (ed. J. W. Cunliffe, 2 vol., Cambridge, 1907), I, 75-86. I have used this rather than B. M. Ward's beautiful edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, printed in 1926 at the Shakespeare Head Press, because it reproduces Gascoigne's revisions of 1575.

³ References are to the original edition, mentioned above in the text.

Martinengo:

I for my part being clothed in Sackcloth, whereas soone after by the great courtesie of the right honourable Sig. Latino Orsino, I was new apparelled accordingly. (fol. 16.)

Gascoigne also draws parallels between the father's career and Martinengo's. Thus:

In Rhodes his race begonne. . . .
 Yea though the peece was lost. . . .
 At Chios many knowe, how hardily he fought. (p. 76.)

Martinengo:

It mouveth me much to remember the losse of those 3. notable Ilands . . . : namely Rhodes. . . . Scio or Chios being lost. . . . And now last of all . . . Famagosta. (fol. A iv.)

After his capture the elder Mounthermer had to pay heavily for his ransom:

He bought his libertie with Landes, and let his goodes ago.
 Zechines * of glistering golde, two thousand was his price. (p. 77.)
 * A peece of golde like the Crusado.

Martinengo:

I offered, and gave my selfe slave to one Sangaccho del Bir, promising hym 500.* Zechins for my raunsome. (fol. 13v.)

* Zechini, be certaine peeces of fine golde.

And finally, when the Turkish fleet was bearing down on his little craft, the father's exhortations recall Malim's marginal comment. He,

Gan cleane forget all wayling wordes, as lavishe of his breath.
 And to his Christian crewe, this (too shorte) tale he told,
 To comfort them which seemde to faint, and make the coward bold.
 (p. 78.)

Malim:

The forwardnesse of the Captaine at daungerous times not onely much comforteth the common soldier, but also increaseth greatly his credite and commendation with all men. (fol. 8v.)

The passage, however, in which Gascoigne has borrowed most freely from *The true Report* is the one describing the horrible fate of Famagusta's governor:

G.

I sawe the noble * *Bragadine*, when
 he was *fleyd quicke*.
 First like a slave enforst to beare
 to every breach,
 Two baskets laden full with earth,
Mustaffa * dyd him teach.
 By whome he might not *passee* before
 he *kyst the grounde*,
 These cruell tormentes (yet with
 mo) that worthy *souldior* found
His eares cut from his head, they
 set him in a *chayre*,
 And from a *maime yard* hoisted him
 aloft into the ayre,
 That so he might be *shewed* with
 crueltie and spight,
 Unto us all, whose weeping eyes dyd
 much abhorre the sight. (p. 80.)

* The governour of Famagosta.
 (p. 80, marg. note.)

* The generall of the *Turkes*. (p.
 80, marg. note.)

M.

The noble *Bragadino* (fol. 2v.)
 [repeated five times, 3v., 10, 12,
 12v. and 13.]
 Thys worthy and pacient gentle-
 man *Bragadino* was led still in the
 presence of that unfaythfull tyrant
Mustafa, to the batteries made unto
 the Citie, whereas he being com-
 pelled to *carrye two baskets of earth*,
 the one uppon hys backe, the other
 in hys hand *slave like*, to every
sundry battery, being enforced also
 to *kusse the ground* as oft as he
 passed by him, was afterward
 brought unto the Sea side, where
 he being placed in a *chaire* to leane
 and stay upon, was winched up in
 that chaire, and fastened unto the
Mameyard of a Galley, and hoisted
 up with a Crane, to *shew him to*
all the Christian soldiers and slaves
 (which were in the haven already
 shipped) he being afterward let
 down, and brought to the market
 place, the tormentors tooke of hys
 clothes from hym, and tacked hym
 unto the Pillary, whereas he was
 most cruelly *fleyed quicke*.

(fols. 13v.-14)

From that worthy and noble *Braga-*
dino . . . *hys eares were cut of*.

(fol. 13.)

The worthy *Bragadino*. (fol. 12.)

Sig. *Bragadino* was . . . *Gouverneur*.

(fol. 2, marg. note.)

Mustafa him selfe *generall of the*
Turkes armie. (fol. 3.)

The following are a few incidental parallels:*

* A few details in his later description of the Battle of Lepanto Gascoigne may have taken from Martinengo's story of the actual siege. Thus, "The wilde fire works are wrought and cast in foemans face," p. 81, (cf. "We being nothing behind or forgetfull to cast wildefire amongst them," fol. 9); "The smoulder stops our nose with stench," p. 81, (cf. "Thys fire

G.

The Christian enemye, the Turke.
(p. 76.)

The fertile coastes of Cyprus soile.
(p. 77.)

The Turke that Tirant he (p. 78)

the walles
Of famous Famagosta * (p. 78.)

* The chiefe Cittie in Cyprus.

To heare those hellishe fiendes in
raging blasphemie,
Defye our onely Saviour, were this
no miserie? (p. 78.)

M.

Those cruell Turkes, auncient pro-
fessed enemies to all Christian Re-
ligion. (fol. A ivv.)

This Iland [Cyprus] is thought to
be very riche, abundant of Wine,
Oyle, Grain, Pitch, Rosin, Allum,
Salt. (fol. B ii.)

That tyraunt Mustafa.

(fol. A ivv.)

That unfaythfull tyrant Mustafa.

(fol. 13v.)

Famagosta the cheefe holde and
fortresse in Cyprus. (fol. A ivv.)

There were in time paste 15. Cities
or famous Townes in it [Cyprus],
but now very fewe, amongst the
which Famagosta is the cheefest.

(fol. B iv.)

Mustafa talking with hym, and
blaspheming the holy name of our
Saviour. (fol. 13.)

ROBERT RALSTON CAWLEY.

Princeton University.

HUNLAFING

The proper name *Hunlafing* occurs in v. 1143 of *Beowulf*, in a passage the meaning of which has been much debated. Since the interpretation of the name has an important bearing on the interpretation, not only of the passage in question, but also of the Finsburg episode as a whole, a study of the name *Hunlafing* ought to be of some interest and value, to Beowulfian scholars at least. In the following I will try to present such evidence as is available and draw such conclusions as the evidence presented seems to justify.

It must be said at once that the reading *Hunlafing* is not the only possibility. Bugge¹ and others have suggested the reading

continued 4. dayes, wherefore we were enforced by reason of the extreme heate and stinche, to withdraw our selves." (fol. 9v.)

¹ *PBB.*, XII, 32.

Hun Lafing, the first name being thought to be that of a warrior, the second that of a sword. But since this reading has latterly been abandoned by all the editors and commentators, and seems no longer to be looked on with favor in any quarter (for excellent reasons, of course, which I need not go into), I will leave it out of my discussion, and confine myself to the reading *Hunlafing*. Broadly speaking, this reading can be interpreted in two ways: one may take the word to be a personal name, or a sword-name. From a strictly formal point of view, either interpretation is legitimate. The suffix *-ing* is not infrequent in personal names, and is regularly used in the formation of patronymics; it is also regular in the formation of sword-names. Naturally, then, the learned have fallen into two camps, according to whether they took *Hunlafing* for a personal name or for a sword-name.

Cosijn seems to have been the first to suggest that *Hunlafing* was a personal name; I know his suggestion only at second-hand, through Boer's brief discussion in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*.² Boer agrees with Cosijn; he takes *Hunlafing* for a patronymic, with reference to either Guðlaf or Oslaf of v. 1148. In other words Guðlaf and Oslaf were brothers; Hunlaf was their father; either Guðlaf or Oslaf, therefore, might properly be called *Hunlafing* 'son of Hunlaf.' This hypothesis was shattered by Chadwick, who pointed out³ that according to the Scandinavian records Hunlaf was brother, not father, of the other two heroes.⁴ If *Hunlafing* is a patronymic, then, the son of Hunlaf must be a nephew of the heroes mentioned in v. 1148, and the nephew's true name has not come down to us; we know him only by his patronymic. The existence of Hunlaf as a saga-hero is confirmed, not only by the *Skjöldunga*, but also by an English reference dug up by Imelmann, and printed in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*.⁵ We may therefore feel assured that the *Hunlafing* of *Beowulf* is to be connected with Hunlaf. But is the reference to Hunlaf's son, or to Hunlaf's sword?

² XLVII, 139.

³ H. M. Chadwick, *Origin of the English Nation*, p. 52, note 1.

⁴ Arngrímur's epitome of the *Skjöldungasaga*, ed. A. Olrik, in *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*, 1894, p. 107.

⁵ XXX, 999. The latinized name of the hero occurs in the gen. sg., as *hunlapi* (doubtless for *Hunlaphi*).

One cannot answer this question offhand. It is needful first to study the usage of the English poet in parallel cases. And if we do this we discover that the poet never uses a patronymic except in connexion with the true name. Mostly the patronymic follows immediately after the true name: Scyld Scefing (4), Higelac Hreþling (1923), Hæðcen Hreþling (2925), Wulf Wonreding (2965). Once it occurs, after but not immediately after the true name, as a variation: Sigemundes (875), Wælsinges (variation, 877). Nowhere do we find a patronymic used alone. Two personal names in *-ing* occur, it is true, *Hem(m)ing* and *Swerting*, but they are not patronymics, but perfectly ordinary names, whatever their ultimate etymology. If we turn to the *Heimskringla* we find a Hemingr Hákonarson and a Hemingr Strútharaldzson, together with a Svertingr Rúnólfsson; similarly, the *Landnámabók* records five Svertingrs, but none with a Svartr for father. Again, the Hemingr of the "Helgakviða Hundingsbana II" is son of Hundingr. Clearly in Scandinavian usage these were true names, not patronymics, and we have every reason to think the same of the *Hem(m)ing* and *Swerting* of the English poet.⁶

Such evidence as *Beowulf* affords, then, is wholly against the interpretation of *Hunlafing* as a patronymic. We may go further. The use of a patronymic alone is a practice foreign to Old Germanic custom and inherently improbable to the highest degree in the present case. An Icelandic friend of mine, Dr. Stefán Einarsson (i. e., Stefán son of Einar), tells me that in present Icelandic speech it is impossible to call him simply Einarsson; the patronymic cannot be used independently, but must be preceded by the true name. This rule is without question a survival of the Old Germanic system of nomenclature. As we have seen, it holds for *Beowulf*, and, so far as I can discover by an extensive though not exhaustive search, for Old English poetry generally. These things being true, the interpretation of *Hunlafing* as a patronymic cannot be maintained.

There remains the possibility that *Hunlafing*, like *Swerting*, is a true personal name, and not a patronymic. This seems to be the view of Huchon,⁷ although he does not make the point clear.

⁶ For the variation between single and double *m* in *Hem(m)ing*, see A. Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*⁴ § 318. No emendation is needed in *Beowulf* 1961.

⁷ R. Huchon, in *Revue Germanique*, III, 626, note 1.

Chambers also apparently had something of the sort in mind, when he published his edition of *Widsith*,⁸ but in his *Beowulf*, published in 1921, he interprets *Hunlafing* as a patronymic. He tells us, "We now know (and this I think should be regarded as outside the region of controversy) that the warrior who put the sword into Hengest's bosom *was* Hunlafing. And about Hunlafing we gather, though very little, yet enough to help us. He is apparently a Dane, the son of Hunlaf, and Hunlaf is the brother of the two champions Guthlaf and Ordlaif."⁹ If we are to justify the first sentence of this quotation, we must modify the last, on some such theory as that Hunlafing, not Hunlaf, was the brother of Guðlaf and Ordlaif (Oslaf), in spite of the *Skjoldunga*. Indeed, we must abolish Hunlaf altogether. Such a course obviously does violence to the records. But even so it does not solve the problem. As a personal name, Hunlaf is familiar enough, but Hunlafing is unknown. Apart from the *Beowulf* passage under discussion, it nowhere occurs. Our only rational course, then, is to give up *Hunlafing* as a personal name, and turn to the alternative hypothesis, according to which it is a sword-name.

So far as I know, the first to advance the theory that *Hunlafing* is a sword-name was Axel Olrik,¹⁰ who interprets the name as meaning 'the sword owned by Hunlaf,' and compares the Scandinavian sword-names *Høking* 'sword owned by Hókr' and *Tyrfing* 'sword owned by Torfi.' After the hero's death the sword would pass into another's possession, of course, but would retain its old name, or, better, it would at that time receive the name which linked it for ever with its former owner. Olrik further points out that the other two swords mentioned by name in *Beowulf* both have names in *-ing*. Olrik's interpretation of *Hunlafing* was apparently familiar to Chadwick, who remarks, "Hengest himself is in possession of a sword called Hunlafing."¹¹ Since Chadwick says nothing more on the subject, he evidently thinks the case closed. Björkman, who seems to have been ignorant of Olrik's discussion, attributes the sword theory to Chadwick, and gives him

⁸ R. W. Chambers, *Widsith*, p. 254.

⁹ R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf*, p. 252.

¹⁰ In *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, I (1903), 68.

¹¹ *Op. and loc. cit.*

short shrift: "Chadwick halt *Hunlafing* fur einen Schwertnamen, eine ganz unwahrscheinliche und unnötige Annahme."¹² He gives no grounds for this astonishing (not to say preposterous) judgment, but his attitude is typical of that of the bulk of Beowulfian scholars in this matter. As for me, I accepted Olrik's interpretation of *Hunlafing* in both my studies of the Finsburg episode,¹³ and my belief in Olrik's interpretation has been strengthened at each renewed study of the problem.

KEMP MALONE.

THE SECOND BOOK OF THE 'CÆDMONIAN' MANUSCRIPT

In his introduction to the facsimile of MS. Junius XI,¹ Sir Israel Gollancz describes carefully the way in which Books I and II are joined in the seventeenth gathering. His explanation renders inescapable the conclusion that the scribes of the second book intended that their work should be considered a continuation of Book I, as Junius himself believed. Hence Book II could not have been originally a wholly independent MS.

Gollancz is certainly wrong, however, in his contention that the folding which produced the ridge across all the folios of Book II preceded the copying of the poem. The following points will make clear this error. (1) The cramped writing of the sixteenth line on pp. 226, 227, and 228 can be matched on the same pages in other lines at considerable distance from the ridge.² (2) Note that the faintness of the ink in l. 16 on these three pages should not be

¹² In Morsbach's *Studien zur engl. Philologie*, LVIII, 75 f.

¹³ *Lit. Hist. of Hamlet*, I, 20 ff.; *JEGP.*, XXV, 157 ff.

¹ *The Cædmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry, Junius XI in the Bodleian Library*. . . . Published for the British Academy by . . . Oxford University Press, MCMXXVII. See pp. xeviii-xcix.

² On p. 226 compare the script of l. 16 with that of l. 21; on p. 227 compare ll. 16-17 with ll. 18-26; on p. 228 compare l. 16 with most of the lines on the upper two-thirds of the page. For the probable cause of this cramped writing, see my *Christ and Satan*, p. xiii.

It should be mentioned that the various points made in this discussion are based upon an examination of a rotograph of Book II which is clearer, even than the facsimile.

confused with the question of cramped penmanship. This faintness, which appears in portions of the sixteenth line on several pages, is undoubtedly due to the effects produced on the ink of the vertical strokes by the repeated bending and unbending of the parchment. (3) There is no unequivocal evidence, such as one would surely expect to find, that a preexisting fold has on any of the leaves of Book II caused the ink to run, or disturbed the direction of the scribes' strokes, many of which, especially in the high or tailed letters, cross the folds. Occasionally, on the contrary, as can be seen at the beginning of p. 214, l. 16, the fold has caused easily visible cracks in the ink of the long, heavy strokes. (4) If more positive evidence is required, let the reader examine the beginning of l. 16, p. 223, where the fold has become so heavy that it has overlapped the lower portions of several letters. Note also the crushed appearance of the middle section of l. 16, p. 222. The fact, noted by Gollancz, that the effects of this ridge have been 'communicated to' pp. 229-30 and some of the concluding pages of Book I is not surprising when one considers the length of time during which all these leaves have been bound up together.

It seems hazardous to attempt any explanation of the folding of pp. 213-28, or to seek to draw from the mere fact of such folding, conclusions in regard to the early history of the codex. It is entirely possible that these pages, which comprise most of the seventeenth gathering, became loosened from the rest of the book in its original binding, and were then folded and inserted somewhere among the other leaves of the volume for safe keeping, only to be re-sewn in their proper place, either while the codex still retained its early binding, or later when it was re-bound in the fifteenth century.

The question whether the LWS. 'Corrector' of Book II also occasionally altered the text of Book I has some bearing on the history of the MS. Clearly, as Professor Gollancz says (p. xxix), it is "wellnigh impossible that the same hand that in *Christ and Satan* was answerable for the dialect change of 'io' from 'e,' in 'wercum' and 'werpan,' in *Genesis* changed 'liod' and 'niotan' to 'leod' and 'neotan.'" (See p. 214, ll. 3 and 27; p. 12, l. 14; p. 21, l. 17.) The fact is, one cannot be at all sure that the 'Corrector' is responsible for the two forms in *Sat.* Moreover, one can be practically certain that the hand which altered *liod* and

notan is not the same as that which made most of the normalizations of pp. 1-26. Since, as Gollancz implies quite justifiably, more than one person may have been involved in the correcting of Book II, the same may well be true of Book I. In any case, this single discrepancy would not by itself be a refutation of the statement "that there are traces in the *Genesis* of the hand of the Late West Saxon corrector who was so active in *Christ and Satan*." The important question is whether some of the corrections of *Gen.* actually resemble those made by the corrector of Book II. Let the reader compare the form of the letters in the corrections found in the following lines: p. 9, l. 11, with p. 218, l. 14, and p. 215, l. 2 (*ge*); 14. 1, 14. 18, 18. 4 with 213. 21, 215. 19, 219. 10 (*e*); 14. 17, 42. 9 with 227. 1 (*a*); 14. 24 with 226. 20 (*he*); 19. 3 with 215. 5, 227. 2 (*y*); 18. 12 with 214. 23, 228. 15 (*t*); 14. 5, 21. 17 with 213. 13, 214. 16 (*eo*); 18. 25 with 221. 17 (*stede*). Note especially the method of correction used in the forms of the word *heofnen*, 18. 12 and 213. 6, and the script of *utan*, 19. 21.

Gollancz assumes (p. xxix) the existence of an 'Annotator' to account for the glosses found in these lines: 213. 11; 216. 20; 217. 15, 19, 27; 218. 2, 3, 14. But the form of the letters in these additions is so exactly similar to that found in the 'Corrector's' work that the glosses and most of the corrections may reasonably be assigned to one hand. Compare the script of *wæron* (218. 19), which G. ascribes to the Corrector, with that of *þær* (218. 3), listed as the Annotator's. The reduction in size and heaviness of stroke which is apparent in these additions is easily to be explained by the probability that the Corrector would write his emendations more heavily than his glosses. Note that after two of the annotations (i. e., in 217. 15 and 218. 14) the writer has properly added the hemistichal dot in the same way as the Corrector has placed the dot after his alterations in 215. 13 and 218. 19.

MERREL D. CLUBB.

Miami University.

ÓÐINN'S MEETINGS WITH SIGMUNDR AND SIGURÐR
IN THE *VÖLSUNGA SAGA*

On p. 114 of *The Heroic Age* (1912) Professor Chadwick writes:

"The Volsunga Saga brings him [Óðinn] into contact with Sigmundr on two occasions: first when he enters Völsungr's hall at the wedding feast and plants in the tree a sword which Sigmundr alone is able to draw out (cap. 3), and again in his last battle when the hero's sword is shattered at the touch of Othn's javelin (cap. 11). Twice also the same saga makes him meet with Sigurðr: first when he chooses for him the horse Grani (cap. 13), and later when he accompanies him on his way to attack the sons of Hundingr (cap. 17; cf. also cap. 18)."

In addition to the two meetings of Óðinn and Sigmundr here mentioned, another occurs in cap. X, when Sigmundr bears the body of Sinfjötli, who has been poisoned by his step-mother, to the fjord:

Sigmundr . . . tók líkit í fang sér ok ferr til skógar ok kom loks at einum firði; þar sá hann mann á einum báti litlum; sá maðr spyrr, ef hann vildi þiggja at honum far yfir fjörðinn; hann jatar því. Skipit var svá lítit, at þat bar þá eigi, ok var líkit fyrst flutt, en Sigmundr gekk með firðinum. Ok því næst hvarf Sigmundi skipit ok svá maðrinn.¹

Professor Chadwick says that Óðinn also met Sigurðr *twice*, although he cites a reference to a third meeting. This occurred while Sigurðr was digging a pit into which he could get to kill Fafnir: Sigurðr gerði gröf eina, ok er hann er at þessu verki, kemr at honum einn gamall maðr með síðu skeggi ok spyrr, hvat hann gerir þar, hann segir; þá svarar inn gamli maðr: þetta er óráð, ger fleiri grafar ok lát þar í renna sveitann, en þú sit í einni ok legg til hjartans orminum!—þá hvarf sá maðr á brottu.²

Professor Chadwick adds, "In all these cases alike the god's identity is not suspected, at least until after his departure." Yet in two of the instances this does not seem conclusive. After Óðinn broke Sigmundr's sword in two with his javelin and Sigmundr had been mortally wounded, Hjördís came to the battlefield and asked if he were to be healed. He answered plainly, "Vill Óðinn ekki, at vér bregðum sverði, síðan er nú brotnaði."³ There is nothing in

¹ *Die Prosaische Edda*, ed. Wilken, Paderborn, 1912, Vol. I, 167, 3 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 179, 6 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 169, 16-17.

the text to indicate that Sigmundr did not know from the first that he had been visited by Oðinn. Likewise when Sigurðr was on his way to attack the sons of Hundingr,⁴ he and his men (*þeir*)—including Reginn in the *Reginsmál*—asked Oðinn his name before they took him aboard their ship. He answered that he was Hnikar and that they might call him Feng or Fjölfnir (*Reginsmál* 18). In *Grimnismál* 47,⁵ Oðinn gives himself both the names *Hnicarr* and *Fjölfnir*. Feng does not seem to occur elsewhere. But even if the voyagers did not recognize any of the three cognomens of Oðinn, the fact that the storm, which had been fierce and threatening, subsided as soon as he came on board must have made them suspect that they were in company with the chief of the gods.

JESS H. JACKSON.

University of Texas.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM TIECK TO CARUS

In the February Number of *MLN*. Professor Zeydel published three letters from Ludwig Tieck to C. G. Carus, apparently the only ones hitherto brought to light. In looking through a collection of autographs of German authors, acquired some years ago, I discovered two letters of Tieck, one of which is likewise addressed to Carus. It is on gray paper, 9 × 15 inches, with the letter J as a watermark in the centre of the sheet. The outer fold bears the address: "Herrn Hofrath Dr. Carus Hochwohlgeb. Allhier." The letter, which had been sealed with red wax, bears in the upper left corner the notation, either of the recipient or of a later owner, N. 30.¹ The text is as follows:

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 177, 6 ff.

⁵ Bugge, *Sæmundar Edda*, Oslo, 1926.

¹ I must express my doubts concerning Professor Zeydel's dating the first of his letters as of the year 1821, on the strength of the recipient's notation 4, 21. If this is a date, I should interpret it as April 21, year unknown. In that letter, moreover, Tieck alludes to a performance of *Lear*: now Herman v. Friesen, in his *Ludwig Tieck*, Wien, 1871, after recording first performances of various other Shakespearean plays at Dresden, states (I, 74): "Endlich wurde am 25. März 1824 'König Lear' gegeben." On the basis of this, I do not see how the first Zeydel letter can be dated earlier than the year 1824.

Geehrtester Freund,

Können Sie uns heut um 6 Uhr das Vergnügen machen, zu uns zu kommen, so will ich versuchen, Ihnen den Lear, den Sie neulich wunschten, vorzulesen. Verzeihen Sie, daß Sie mei. Vorschlag so spät erhalten, der Vorsatz wird immer so spät gefaßt, daß ich es nicht fruher machen konnte.

Ihr

ganz ergebener
L. Tieck.

Samstag früh.

It is not difficult to date this letter. In Friedr. v. Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch*, Neue Folge, 6. Jahrgang, 1845, pp. 193-238, there is an article by G. C. Carus: *Ludwig Tieck. Zur Geschichte seiner Vorlesungen in Dresden*. On pp. 208, 209, Carus writes:

Glücklicherweise sind mir von den verschiedenen Gedankenzügen, die mir diese Abende erregten, einige Erinnerungsblätter geblieben, welche vor manchem Jahre unmittelbar nach solchen Abenden, und zwar oft noch in später mitternächtlicher Stunde niedergeschrieben worden sind; diese gebe ich denn hier. . . . Am öftersten hat mich der britische Dichter veranlaßt, meine Gedanken, wie sie, während Tieck seine Werke uns las, in mir aufstiegen, nach der Lectüre niederzuschreiben. Ich lasse diese Aufsätze gleich hier und zwar nach der chronologischen Ordnung, in welcher sie geschrieben sind, mitfolgen, und glaube ihnen weitere besondere Einleitungen nicht voraussenden zu dürfen.

Abends den 28. October 1827.

Nach dem Lesen vom Lear.

"Durch Sturm, Regen und Finsterniß komme ich zurück von Tieck, wo der Lear vorgelesen wurde.

Ein solches Lesen, wo das Stück recht mit einemmale wie ein aufgerolltes Palmenblatt sich ausbreitet, hat seine besondern Vorzüge, und zumal heute fand ich Alles so zusammenstimmend: wenig Menschen, nicht zu helle Erleuchtung; draußen, wie im Lear selbst, arges Regenwetter, zwiefach niedergießend, aus Dachrinnen und Traufen, deren Wasser vom Winde trübselig gegen das Fenster geworfen wurde, nur zuweilen vom dumpfen Rollen der Wagen übertönt."

As October 28, 1827, moreover, fell on a Saturday, the day mentioned in the letter, we may be reasonably sure that this was the invitation to the reading just described.

W. KURRELMEYER.

A SECOND SOURCE OF LOPE'S *EL CASTIGO*
DEL DISCRETO

Bandello's *novella* I, 35 as the source of Lope de Vega's *comedia* *El castigo del discreto* was announced recently by W. L. Fichter¹ and repeated later in the study preceding his edition of the play.² In the latter work Professor Fichter compared the *novella* and *comedia* and indicated that there were many differences between the two. He says that "Some of these differences were indicated by the exigencies of Lope's theatre; others were the result of his own creative fancy."³ "The friar he converted into a young gallant such as was typical in the *comedia*."⁴ "In the *novella*, for example, Bandello gave no indication of motivation for Casandra's action. Lope, however, distinctly motivated her fall from grace, showing her from the first to be a neglected wife who had good reason to become susceptible to her husband's praise of his gallant rescuer."⁵ He then speaks of the rôle which Casandra's jealousy plays, and at the close of his study he adds: "Although his amours and neglect of his wife could not, according to the prevailing code, excuse similar failings on her part, they did foster an inclination to seek attention elsewhere. More imprudent even was his excessive praise of the stranger, motivated though it was by his gratitude, since such approval served to inspire his wife's lapse from virtue."⁶

Obviously the "praise" motif is significant; in fact the plot gets under way immediately after Casandra hears the stranger praised by her husband, Ricardo. This is not an original device with Lope. Attention has already been called elsewhere⁷ to the resemblance of the first story of Ser Giovanni's *Il Pecorone* to an episode in the Moorish tale *Historia del Abencerraje y la hermosa*

¹ *RE.*, 1925, xvi, 185-186.

² Lope de Vega's *El castigo del discreto*, together with a study of conjugal honor in his theater. Instituto de las Españas. New York, 1925.

³ P. 24.

⁴ P. 26.

⁵ P. 26.

⁶ Pp. 70-71.

⁷ J. P. W. Crawford, Un episodio de "El Abencerraje" y una "Novella" de Ser Giovanni. *Revista de Filología Española*, 1923, x, 281-287.

Jarifa. Lope's comedia *El remedio en la desdicha* is based on this tale which, he implies, he obtained from the *Diana* of Montemayor, but the event: "nos calificaron por verdadero las Corónicas de Castilla en las conquistas del reino de Granada."⁸ The episode in question, wherein a gentleman praises a neighbor to his wife so highly that she becomes amorously interested in him and by letter arranges a secret meeting with him, does not appear in the *Diana* version of the Moorish tale, nor does it appear in the only extant copy of the *Corónica* which has come down to us as a fragment and which ends before the proper place for the episode to be introduced.⁹ Where Lope read the "praise" episode, whether in the *Inventario* of Villegas (which seems doubtful, although Menéndez y Pelayo believed that Lope knew this version,¹⁰) or in the printed *Corónica* (if it really appeared there) it is impossible to determine. It does seem obvious, however, that Lope made slight use of it in *El remedio en la desdicha* when he developed the sub-plot of the love affairs of Narváez and Alara.

If it can be granted that Lope was familiar with the "praise" episode, it becomes easy to see how he has cleverly combined material from two sources in *El castigo del discreto*. The principal characters, Ricardo, his wife Casandra, and the lauded stranger Felisardo are all in their proper rôles. It is not necessary to convert the friar of Bandello into "a young gallant such as was typical in the comedia." The writing of a letter by Casandra to Felisardo arranging a rendezvous may also have been suggested by the episode in the Moorish tale. What is most significant is the importance of the "praise" element in motivating Casandra's "fall from grace." Without it we should have only the jealousy of a neglected wife, a device which, though not infrequently employed in developing plots of comedias,¹¹ could hardly have enabled Ricardo

⁸ *Dedicatoria to El remedio en la desdicha*, ed. Clásicos castellanos, vol. 39, 2-5.

⁹ The *Corónica* is reproduced in facsimile in *Bulletin Hispanique*, 1923, xxv, plates III-X.

¹⁰ *Obras de Lope de Vega* publicadas por la Real Academia Española, xi, xxxvii.

¹¹ Cf. H. Alpern, "Jealousy as a Dramatic Motive in the Spanish Comedia," *RR.*, 1923, xiv, 276-285. This article does little more than indicate the frequency of the jealousy theme.

to decide "on a milder and yet adequate punishment" (his first thought was to punish her by death) "when he realizes that his praise of the man is responsible for her change of heart and constitutes a grave indiscretion on his part."¹²

It is quite probable therefore, that the differences between the Italian *novella* and *El castigo del discreto* are in a large measure due to the utilization of the "praise" theme with which Lope was familiar.¹³

GEORGE IRVING DALE.

Cornell University.

A TRIPLE BURLESQUE

The first half of the eighteenth century saw the publication of an extraordinary number of burlesque poems in the form of mock-heroics and parodies, Hudibrastics and travesties. This sophisticated movement had as its motif the creation of an incongruity between style and subject. Coming in 1751, at the end of a long development in burlesque writing, the *Old Woman's Dunciad*, undoubtedly by William Kenrick, is an instance of combined burlesque which is probably unique.

Kenrick had begun his career of catholicity in enmities; his libelling was to include such men as Fielding,¹ Johnson, Garrick, and Goldsmith. Christopher Smart had had a very large part in *The Midwife, or the Old Woman's Magazine* (usually adopting some variant of "Mary Midnight" as a pseudonym), and in 1750 and 1751 his blank verse poems had captured prizes at Cambridge. "Drawn by Newberry into the vortex of Grub Street animosities, Smart further conceived an 'Old Woman's Dunciad,' but he was anticipated in this by William Kenrick, who used the idea to pay off a grudge against its originator, whereupon Smart abandoned the design."²

¹² Lope de Vega's *El castigo del discreto*, ed. cit., p. 22.

¹³ Longfellow's "Galgano," it may be of interest to add, is based on Ser Giovanni's version of this episode. Cf. E. Goggio, "Italian Influences on Longfellow's Works," *RR.*, xvi (1925), 215-220. Also J. P. W. Crawford, "El Abencerraje" and Longfellow's "Galgano," *Hispania* (California), ix (1926), 165-169.

¹ To whom the *Old Woman's Dunciad* was ironically dedicated.

² *DNB*, Thomas Seccombe's article on Smart. The basis for this state-

The full title of this rather scarce piece is worth giving:³

The so much talk'd of and expected Old Woman's Dunciad. Or, Midwife's Master-Piece. Containing the most choice Collection of *Humdrums* and *Drivellers*, that was ever expos'd to public View. By Mary Midnight. With Historical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, by Margelina Scribelinda Macularia. Publish'd pursuant to Act of Parliament, as the greatest Work ever before attempted in any *Age, Country, or Language*.

The heroic couplet is the natural verse form for any work with "Dunciad" in its title, but blank verse is here used, perhaps in ridicule of Smart's prize-winning efforts. The remarkable thing about this satire is its use of three kinds of burlesque: the regular text (184 ll.) is in the most extravagant Miltonics, greatly Latinized and in many places hardly intelligible; underneath the text the "Interpretation" (199 ll.) lucidly repeats in Hudibrastic couplets the matter of the text; at the foot of the page burlesque prose annotations discuss the text, mocking the sort of thing Bentley did with *Paradise Lost* and comparable to many of the notes in the *Dunciad* and to William Dodd's annotations in his *New Book of the Dunciad*, 1750.⁴ It is not uncommon to find burlesque footnotes accompanying burlesque poetry, but the presence of two metrical versions, each done with some skill, alongside burlesque commentary, places Kenrick's performance, as far as I can determine, in a class apart.

The poem is a description of Dulness in her cave with her two sons. Smart and two others, whom it is difficult to identify with certainty today, are lampooned with a savagery that finally descends into sordidness. The most delightful feature of the entire production is the diction of the exaggerated Miltonisms, such as "The *Student's* Honour circumclangor'd wide With Buccination" and

ment is a note on line 183 in Kenrick's *Pasquinade*, 1753; the preface to the *Old Woman's Dunciad* contains an explanation of Mrs. Midnight's stratagem in anticipating her enemies "to their utter confusion" and refers to the poem as her own idea, thus enhancing the joke. Cf. an advertisement at the end of the third number of the *Midwife*, Dec., 1750.

³ I have used the British Museum copy. A third edition in the same year is recorded by Halkett and Laing as in the Bodleian.

⁴ Many of these notes are really amusing, especially those of verbal criticism and the explanation of the purpose of the "Interpretation," namely, academic convenience. But reasons of space forbid reproduction here.

"Assist the Trump of Fame debilitate With Garrulations." Three pairs of examples will show how the two versions carry out the opposing methods of burlesque by the use of language which in the one case elevates, and in the other degrades, the subject.

Which porcuised *Ulysses* vagrant train!

And turn'd *Greek* Sailors into Pork! (p. 13)

in Dormitation mounts

Aquiline Wings, and in Etherial Space

Builds castral Edifices.

Fancies himself an Eagle there,

And raises Castles in the Air. (p. 15)

Behold, with gloomy Brow, contracted Frown,

In hypocondriac cephalalgic vext,

He sits contristate; manducating Thoughts

In vaccal Ruminatation.

See, down i' th' Mouth, with Brow contracted,

With Head-ach and the Hip-distracted,

He sits in the Dumps; so ruminating

As thoughtless Cows do when they're eating.

(pp. 19-20)

Certainly this work has a claim to distinction among the most singular "ever before attempted in any *Age, Country, or Language*." One may even hope that it will remain *sui generis*.

RICHMOND P. BOND.

Harvard University.

THE DATE OF THE *GARLANDE OF LAURELL*

The *Garlande of Laurell* is the only poem by John Skelton which is known to have been published during his lifetime. The date of the edition is 1523, and it was done by Faukes. The poem contains a long list of his works, many of them now lost, and it consequently furnishes a definitive date for the poems mentioned therein. The prefatory lines state that it was "studiously dyuyseed at Sheryfhotton Castell, in the Foreste of Galtres." From the content, we learn that it was written at a time when Elizabeth, Countess of Surrey, was living at the castle with her train of ladies, who are named in short separate poems.

There are two kinds of evidence which go to prove that the poem was written in April, 1523. Dyce says concerning the dating: "The date of its composition is unknown; but it was certainly produced at an advanced period in his life." The first type of evidence is largely deductive. 1523 furnishes a definitive date beyond which we cannot go. We know from the poem itself that it was written in the spring, when the weather was warm enough to permit Skelton to indulge in a nap in the forest of Galtres.

That, me to rest, I lent me to a stumpe
Of an oke, that sometyme grew full streyghte . . .
Whyhs I stode musynge in this medytatyon,
In slumbrynge I fell and halfe in a slepe . . ."

The poem later describes the presentation to Skelton of a garland woven by the Countess and her ladies. Therefore it is safe to assume that it could not have been written earlier than April, whatever the year. Evidently the Countess, with a train, was occupying the home of her father-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk. But we know from the State Papers that the Earl of Surrey and his family resided in Dublin from 1519 to 1522. He brought his wife and children with him when he became Viceroy in 1519, and they remained in Dublin Castle until his government closed in the middle of April, 1522. He then settled his family in Tendring Hall, as his "Catering Book" shows. In December he was made Lord Treasurer at the resignation of his father, and in February, 1523, he was commissioned general-in-chief of an army raised for the invasion of Scotland. All through the spring and summer he was occupied in raiding the Borderside. Albany had left Scotland to seek aid in France, and the advantage was seized to negotiate with the Scottish nobles, to detach the Queen Mother and the friends of the young King from Albany, and to weaken the Regent's power. From this time on, the State Papers show that he was stationed at Newcastle, on the border between England and Scotland. Thus external evidence shows that the poem was probably written in the spring of 1523, at the time when his family were living at Sheriff Hutton, the most available northern seat.

The internal evidence is still more conclusive. In true mediæval fashion, the poem opens with an astronomical dating:

Arectyng my syght towarde the zodyake,
The sygnes xii for to heholde a farre,
When Mars retrogradant reversyd his bak,

Lord of the yere in his orbioular,
 Put up his sworde, for he coude make no warre,
 And whan Lucina plenary did shyne,
 Scorpione ascendynge degrees twyse nyne.

Through the kindness of Professor Schlesinger of the Astronomy Department of Yale University, I have been able to date the poem from the passage above. Mars retrogrades once in every two years. The poem was published in the fall of 1523. The opposition of Mars in 1926, the most recent year of retrograding, was 1926.84. To bring it back to a time previous to 1523 we subtract the number of synodic periods which have elapsed since then, and we have 1523.25, or a quarter of the year 1523, which is April. This confirms the previous conclusions, but still more confirmatory is the fact that working back from this point every two years brings the retrograding of Mars to February, 1521, and the earliest possible date is November, 1514. It is only in 1523 that we have Mars retrograding in April. So both internal and external evidence point to April, 1523, as the date for the composition for the *Garlande of Laurell*.

HELEN STEARNS.

Yale University.

SHAKESPEARE'S PARAPHRASE OF HIS THOUGHT-EXECUTING FIRES

You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,
 Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts, *Lear*, III, ii, 4-5.¹

What does *thought-executing* mean in Lear's address to the storm that is to reduce him to a "fever of the mad"? Does it mean (1) "doing execution with rapidity equal to thought"² or (2) "executing the thought of Him who casts you"³?

It seems possible to use Shakespeare's own words in support of (1) on the basis of a parallel passage in the *Tempest*. In Act I, sc. ii Ariel reports the storm to Prospero, who asks (II. 206-210):

¹ All Shakespeare quotations are taken from Aldis Wright's Cambridge Edition.

² Johnson. See Variorum, Vol. v, 1880, p. 171.

³ Moberly. See Variorum, Vol. v, 1880, p. 171.

Pros. My brave spirit!
Who was so firm, so constant that this coil
Would not infect his reason?

Ariel. Not a soul
But felt a fever of the mad and play'd
Some tricks of desperation.

Since it is impossible to read this passage without remembering the infection of Lear's reason brought about by a similar storm so great that "man's nature cannot carry the affliction nor the fear," would it not be equally impossible for Shakespeare to have written it without so remembering?

A comparison of the description of the storm in *Lear* and in the *Tempest* reveals striking parallelism:

<i>Lear.</i>	<i>Tempest.</i>
1. You sulphurous . . . fires.	1. Fires and cracks of sulphurous roaring
2. Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts	2. Precursors o' the dreadful thunder-claps
3. Thought-executing fires	3. Momentary and sight outrunning

Act I, sc. ii. (201-204)

In each case three ideas are used to describe lightning. Two of them are identical. Lightning is (1) sulphurous and (2) precedes thunder. In the *Tempest* there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the third attribute. Lightning is transient and quicker than sight.

If, then, Shakespeare had Lear's storm in mind when composing the storm scene in the *Tempest*, if of the three ideas he used to describe lightning in both instances, two are identical, is it not more than probable that the third is in the same vein? If in the *Tempest* he thought of lightning as quicker than sight, is it not highly likely that this is a reflex of the corresponding passage in *Lear*? And in this case it would seem that "momentary and sight-outrunning" is Shakespeare's own paraphrase of "thought-executing."

PRINGLE BARRET.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

A NOTE ON JOHN DONNE'S EARLY READING

It will be recalled that the motto above Donne's eighteen year old picture was in Spanish. There has been much speculation about it, and the words have been variously translated by Walton, Gosse, and half a dozen others. The words are, "Antes muerto que mudado."

I have discovered that the source of this motto is Montemayor's *Diana*, and, considering the context, there can be no further doubt as to the meaning of the words. They occur in the last stanza of the first song, and are the words Diana wrote on the sand in pledging her troth to Sirenus:

Sobre el arena sentada
De aquel río la vi yo
Do con el dedo escribió:
"Antes muerta que mudada."
Mira el amor que ordena
Que os viene hacer creer
Cosas dichas por mujer
Y escritas en el arena.

Seated upon the sand
Of that river I saw her
When she wrote with her finger:
"Rather dead than changed."
Look you what love ordains,
That comes to make you believe
Things said by woman
And written in sand.

Gosse's translation, "Before I am dead how shall I be changed,"¹ and Miss Ramsay's French, "Combien dois-je changer, avant que je meure,"² always unwarranted by the plain words, thus become impossible nonsense. Only Keynes, Donne's bibliographer, has made even a passable translation, "Sooner death than change," which does not distort the meaning.

Donne's interest in *La Diana* may be said to have been lifelong, for in a letter written about 1616 he says, "I begin to be past hope of dying: and I feelee that a little rag of Monte Magor, which

¹ Gosse, *Life and Letters*, I (1899), p. 24.

² *Les Doctrines Medievales chez Donne*, 1924, p. 38.

I read last time I was in your chamber, hath wrought prophetically upon mee, which is, that Death came so fast towards mee, that the overjoy of that recovered mee."³ This is from the fifth song, Silvano's lines:

. amor que lastimandome
Jamás canso, no impede el acordarseme
De tanto mal, y muero en acordandome.
Mire a Diana, y vi luego abreviarseme;
El placer y contento, en solo viendola,
Y a mi pesar la vida vi alargarseme.

Love which tormenting me
Never took rest, hinders me not the remembering
Such a great sickness, I die in recalling it.
I looked at Diana, and saw then my cutting short;
Contentment and pleasure was only in seeing it,
And to my grief then, I saw life lengthening.

I can also show that Donne traveled in Spain and was at the court before 1595, but since the evidence requires more time and space to present than the limits of this note would warrant, the proof must be deferred until my thesis on the Spanish Influence on John Donne is completed.

T. EDWARD FERRILL.

Harvard University.

ANOTHER LETTER BY HORACE WALPOLE

A letter of Horace Walpole's which I do not find has been published is preserved among the *Percy Family Letters and Papers* (Vol. 32, p. 170) at Alnwick Castle, to which I recently had access through the generosity of the Duke of Northumberland. It is addressed to that Duchess of Northumberland who appears from time to time in Walpole's correspondence, sometimes the subject of his jests for her "jovial magnificence"; sometimes his hostess, as at the fête for the Queen's brother in 1762,—“quite a fairy scene”; sometimes his companion, as on the occasion of the visit to the Cock Lane Ghost.¹

The present letter from Walpole to the Duchess suggests a neigh-

³ C. E. Merrill, Jr., *Letters to Several Persons of Honor*, 1910, p. 254.

¹ In 1759 he sent her a copy of his *Fugitive Pieces* and of his *Catalogue*

borly conversation—perhaps at Sion House but a short distance from Strawberry Hill—concerning the history of the herald's office. Walpole writes to give her the benefit of his antiquarian researches. The tone of the letter, friendly and deferential, is at variance with that of his satirical description of the lady in 1764 in his *Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third*. The letter reads as follows:

Strawberryhill

April 2d 1760

Madam

The account of *Percy-Heralds* which I had the honour to mention to your Ladyship yesterday, is in a book called a *Collection of curious Discourses written by eminent Antiquarians upon several heads in our English antiquities*. These pieces were published by T. Hearne in 1720. In one of the tracts called *The Duty & Office of an Herald of Armes* It is said p. 263. that in the time of King Henry 4th among a few others was *Percy-Herald*: & in the reign of Edward 4th p. 265. that the Earl of Northumberland had *Northumberland-Herald*: as He had given under Henry 7th when it is particularly recorded that none even of the great Peers had Heralds but the Earl of Northumberland; even the Lord Marquis (of Worcester) having but a Pursuant. I flatter myself that these additional proofs of the greatness of yr Ladyship's House will not be unacceptable, as the Discovery is a satisfaction to & an evidence of the attachment of

Madam

Yrs Ladyship's

Most obliged & obedient humble

Servant and Tenant

Hor Walpole

One surmises that this information was acceptable to the future "vice-majesties of Ireland," as Walpole delighted to term the Duke and Duchess in a letter to Horace Mann in 1763. Their fondness for traditional splendor he had described to the same correspondent in 1752: "They live by the etiquette of the old peerage, have Swiss porters, the Countess has her pipers—in short they will soon have no estate. (*Letters*, vol. III, p. 128.)

HELEN SARD HUGHES.

Wellesley College.

of Royal and Noble Authors. The gift is acknowledged in a letter from the Duchess (*Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Toynbee, *Supplement*, vol. III, p. 180), expressing esteem for the author, and concluding with reference to the *Catalogue*, "[I] am truly grateful for your gratifying my impertinent curiosity upon that subject."

THE MODEL FOR POPE'S VERSES *TO THE AUTHOR OF
A POEM INTITLED 'SUCCESSIO'*

Pope's verses *To the Author of a Poem intitled 'Successio'* were first published anonymously in *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations, by Several Hands*, in 1712. When the first edition of his collected works was published in 1717 Pope omitted this satire, perhaps, as Roscoe suggests,¹ because he feared that it might be regarded as an attack on the Hanoverian dynasty, in honor of which Settle had written *Successio*. In any case, although the authorship of the verses seems to have been no secret,² they were omitted from all the English editions of the works until Roscoe restored them in 1824.³

Roscoe and the subsequent editors of Pope have, however, overlooked one fact in connection with the satire. In *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations* it was preceded by the lines *On Silence*, and the two poems were described as *Two Copies of Verses, Written some Years since in Imitation of the Style of Two Persons of Quality*. *On Silence* has long been recognized as an imitation of Rochester's *On Nothing*, but no one has attempted to identify the model for the second poem. It is, quite clearly, Dorset's *To Mr. Edward Howard, on his incomparable, incomprehensible Poem, called 'The British Princes.'* The full extent of the likeness between the two poems is apparent only when they are read in their entirety, but some of the more striking parallels of thought and expression are given below.

Come on, ye critics, find one fault who dares;

—Dorset.

Begone, ye critics, and restrain your spite,

—Pope.

¹ *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.* (London, 1824), II, 55.

² They are included in the presumably unauthorized Dublin edition of Pope's works published by Grierson in 1727, and Warburton, in 1751, acknowledged their authenticity in his note on *The Dunciad*, I, 182, although he did not reprint the satire.

³ They were called to his attention by Isaac Disraeli, *Quarrels of Authors* (London, 1814), I, 298 ff. (I have seen only the New York edition, of the same year, in which Disraeli's discussion of the authorship will be found at I, 169-79.)

Thy style's the same, whatever be thy theme,
As some digestions turn all meat to phlegm:

—Dorset.

Wit pass'd through thee no longer is the same,
As meat digested takes a diff'rent name;

—Pope.

Therefore, dear Ned, at my advice, forbear
Such loud complaints 'gainst critics to prefer,
Since thou art turn'd an arrant libeller;
Thou set'st thy name to what thyself dost write;
Did ever libel yet so sharply bite?

—Dorset.

Therefore, dear friend, at my advice give o'er
This needless labor; and contend no more
To prove a *dull succession* to be true,
Since 'tis enough we find it so in you.

—Pope.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

Yale University.

THE DATE OF SPENSER'S DEATH

The date commonly given for the death of Edmund Spenser, January 16, 1599, is based on a letter written in London on January 17, 1599, according to the postscript; the writer, John Chamberlain, made this statement to his correspondent, Sir Dudley Carlton: "Spenser, our principall poet comming lately out of Ireland, died at Westminster on Satterday last."¹ This extract, unquestionably authentic, has been constantly misinterpreted because of the change in calendars in 1752, when Great Britain adopted the Gregorian or New Style calendar and ordered the day after September 2 to be numbered September 14. In 1866 the publication of J. J. Bond's *Handy-Book of Rules and Tables* provided this information and a perpetual calendar (1066-1866), showing that January 1, 1598-9, came on Monday; January 17 fell therefore on Wednesday, and "Satterday last" meant January 13.² The editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine* had reached the same

¹ *Letters written by John Chamberlain*, edited by Sarah Williams, for the Camden Society, 1861; p. 41.

² Bond, p. 95 and 262.

conclusion in November, 1850, but included "evidence" against it in the following footnote appended to J. P. Collier's article called "Chaucer's Tomb: Spencer's Death": "The Saturday before the 17th January, 1598-9 O.S. was, we believe, the 13th January. But according to the autograph evidence of Henry Capell adduced by Todd (Spenser, i. cxxix), Spenser died 'apud diversorium in platea Regia apud Westmonasterium juxta Londinium 16^o die Januarij, 1598.' The day of Spenser's death seems therefore to rest uncertain between these two days, the 13th and 16th January, 1598-9."³

This editor inadvertently wrote the correct form "Londinium" instead of "London" in the original, which adds more bad Latin in the following phrase: "Juxtaq; Geffereum Chaucer, in eadem Ecclesia supradict. (Honoratissimi Comitis Essexiae impensis) sepelit."⁴ This seems to have been deliberately distorted to conceal borrowing from Camden's *Annales* (1615), which says: "Westmonasterii prope Chaucerum impensis Comitatus Essexiae inhumatus."⁵ Likewise "in platea Regia" is probably nothing more than a literal translation of three words in Ben Jonson's *Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (1619), where Spenser is said to have "died for lake of bread jn King street."⁶ The date was obviously made up from Chamberlain's letter with reference to the New Style calendar, which makes January 17, 1598-9 fall on Sunday. Grosart made this calculation independently, rejecting the Capell "autograph evidence" as one of J. P. Collier's "innumerable pseudo-entries and proved forgeries" because he found it quoted without acknowledgement in the latter's edition of Spenser, and had not seen the original passage.⁷ Todd said it was "communicated by the learned and reverend John Brand, Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries" from the title-page of his own copy of the *Faerie Queen*, second edition (1596),

³ *Gentleman's Magazine*, xxxiv, 487.

⁴ Rev. H. J. Todd, *Works of Edmund Spenser*, 1805; i, cxxix.

⁵ *Annales* . . . *regnante Elizabetha*, 172; quoted in F. I. Carpenter, *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* (1923), 43.

⁶ Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson (Oxford, 1925), i, 137.

⁷ A. B. Grosart, *Complete Works of Edmund Spenser* (1882), i, 236: "This *juxta London* as descriptive of Westminster is suspicious"; J. P. Collier, *Works of Edmund Spenser* (1862), i, cxlv.

"which appears to have belonged originally to Henry Capell; after whose autograph, the date of 1598 is added . . . Henry Capell has added *apud diversorium* in the paler ink with which his own name is written." No one but Brand has ever mentioned such an entry, and Musgrave's *Obituary* has no record of a Henry Capell living in 1598-9.⁸ If Brand, who was only eight years old in 1752, was responsible for this forgery, he forgot the change of calendars from Old Style to New Style. Grosart, making the same mistake honestly, has been followed by almost all biographers and editors to date, but in future the day of Spenser's death should be stated correctly as January 13, 1599.⁹

W. I. ZEITLER.

Harvard University.

"A NOTE ON *EASTWARD HO*, I, ii, 178"

In a note with this title (*MLN.*, Jan., 1928, pp. 28-9), Professor Robert Withington unaccountably fails to cite the recent edition of *Eastward Hoe* by Dr. Julia Harris (Yale Studies in English, No. 73, 1926), and thereby has missed perhaps more illuminating allusions to the elephant and castle than he himself gives from sources near in time to the play. He could, of course, have taken one of the two allusions given by Miss Harris (p. 114) from Bullen, from whom she takes it: "See Burton, *Anat. of Mel.*, ed. 1660, p. 476, 'To put a thousand oaks and an hundred oxen into a suit of apparel to wear a whole manor on his back.'" The other parallel she finds to "Pray heaven, the *Elephant* carry not his Castle on his backe" she records as in *Miseries of Inforced Marriage* (Dodsley 5. 24): "A cheating rascal will teach me, . . . they that have stalked like a huge elephant with a Castle on their necks."

⁸ *Harleian Soc. Publ.* (1899), XLIV, i, 341. Sir Henry Capel, K. B., of Tewkesbury died in 1696; the date of his birth is unknown (*DNB.*, III, 926).

⁹ Carpenter accepts Grosart's date in his *Reference Guide*, p. 22, but mentions J. W. Hales in Chambers's *Encyclopaedia* (1897), who says merely this: "On January the 13th (not the 16th, as is usually said; see John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton, January 17, 1599) he died." See Chambers, 1927 ed., IX, 582.

Why not add Ben Jonson (*Discoveries*, ed. Castelain, p. 18) on Hearsay News?—

That an elephant, '630, came hither Ambassadour from the Great *Mogull* (who could both write and read) and was every day allow'd twelve cast of bread, twenty Quarts of *Canary sack*, besides Nuts and Almonds the Citizens' wives sent him. That hee had a *Spanish* Boy to his Interpreter, and his chiefe *negotiation* was, to conferre or practise with *Archy*, the principall fool of *State*, about stealing hence *Windsor Castle*, and carrying it away on his back if he can.

For the earliest references in English to elephants and castles, see Bosworth-Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dict.*, s. vv. *ylp* and *wig-hūs*.

LANE COOPER.

Cornell University.

"AGRIPPA'S SHADOWS"

In the second prologue of Lyly's *Campaspe* there is a rather obscure allusion to "Agrippa his shadowes, who in the moment they were seene, were of any shape one woulde conceiue."

Here "Agrippa" seems to be Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim (1486-1535), who was accounted a great magician or necromancer. And his "shadowes" must be the shades of the dead which he was said to call up at will. Compare the very similar allusion in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, I, 1, where Faustus says he

Will be as cunning as Agrippa was,
Whose shadowes made all Europe honor him.

There is a good note on these two lines in Dr. A. W. Ward's edition, Oxford, 1901, pp. 113-15.

Perhaps the best commentary on the *Campaspe* passage would be a reference to Thomas Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*, where some of Agrippa's necromantic feats are recorded. (ed. Grosart, V, 75-77; McKerrow, II, 252-53).

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Johns Hopkins University.

THE *ESSAY ON MAN*, EPISTLE II, LINES 31-34

Contemporary and later comment on Pope's lines in Epistle II of the *Essay on Man*,

Superior beings, when of late they saw
A mortal man unfold all nature's law,
Admired such wisdom in an earthly shape,
And showed a Newton as we show an ape,¹

has been divided between the seeking of far-fetched comparisons and severe berating of Pope for "likening Newton to an ape."

It is not necessary to go to Plato or to the *Zodiac* of Palengeni, as ingenious commentators have done, to find the "source" for such an idea.² The conception of a "vast chain of Being," extending from celestial creatures down to the lowest animal, was so widespread in Pope's day that there could seem nothing more natural than the comparison which the poet makes.³

A passage in the *Spectator*, No. 621 (Nov. 17, 1714), illustrates the wide currency of the idea, and parallels most closely the much-discussed passage in the *Essay on Man*:

If the Notion of a gradual Rise in Beings, from the meanest to the most High, be not a vain Imagination, it is not improbable that an Angel looks down upon a Man, as a Man doth upon a Creature which approaches the nearest to the rational Nature. By the same Rule (if I may indulge my Fancy in this Particular) a superior Brute looks with a kind of Pride on one of an inferior Species.

DONALD F. BOND.

*Washington University,
St. Louis.*

¹ Elwin-Courthope, II, 378.

² Warton, *ibid.*

³ Cf., among others, Archbishop William King's *De origine mali*, 1702 (English translation, *An Essay on the Origin of Evil*, London, 1731, pp. 83-85) and Addison, *Spectator*, No. 519 (Oct. 25, 1712).

REVIEWS

The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. A Bibliotic Study. By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. New York: The Tenny Press, 1927. Pp. vii + 135.

In *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, Dr. Tannenbaum continues his valuable series of acute studies on disputed documents in the Elizabethan period. Here he produces evidence to substantiate his claim (1) that he has identified the three still missing "authors" in the play, (2) has established the exact date of the play, (3) has shown the purpose of the play, and (4) why it was never completed, as also (5) why Tyllney "refused to permit it to be acted," (6) that he has shown that Kyd did not cease writing for the stage in 1587, (7) and that his patron was Ferdinando Stanley, the fifth Earl of Derby, (8) from which it follows that Kyd, Marlowe, and Dekker were writing for Strange's company in the early nineties.

All these conclusions except parts of (1) are based fundamentally on the identification of hand C as that of Thomas Kyd, and must stand or fall with that identification. But that identification is impossible both because Kyd could not have written some of the things which are in hand C, and because the prompter of the Shakspearean company, Thomas Vincent, has docketed some of the work in this hand as his own.

Dr. Tannenbaum, on the basis of handwriting, would identify the hand which, as all critics so far agree, wrote the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, hand C in the play of *Sir Thomas More*, and the now fragmentary plot called *Fortune's Tennis* as that of Thomas Kyd. In the case of *Fortune's Tennis*, other facts would seem to make this identification impossible. These center around the date of the plot, which Sir Edmund Chambers would place about 1602, and Dr. Greg as almost certainly after October 1597, both attaching it to the Admiral's men.

Fortune's Tennis would seem certainly to have belonged to the Admiral's men, since five out of the seven actors mentioned in the fragmentary plot—Singer, Tailor, Cartwright, Charles, and Sam—were certainly all together at one time in the organization, while both probability and the records would seem to make it clear that they were never together in any other organization. That Charles and Sam are Charles Massye and Samuel Rowley is evident from the fact that these actors appear consistently as Charles and Sam in a plot of June 3, 1597, and with the addition of "Mr." in two other later plots, all three known to belong to the Admiral's men. Since *Fortune's Tennis* belongs to the Admiral's, George can also

be identified as George Somerset, who appears regularly c. 1598-1602 as a manly attendant, though he has also wrongly been made a "child." That the plot belongs about this period 1597-1602 is shown by the fact that although actors, especially the hired men, shifted rather rapidly, yet six out of seven known actors of *Fortune's Tennis* are traceable with the Admiral's in this period. Of the six, all except Singer, who was certainly a member at the time, appear in the *Battle of Alcazar*, and all except Tailor in *1 Tamar Cam*, while only two appear in *Frederick and Basilea*, though Singer was also a member at the time. This affinity becomes still more significant when we examine the chronology of this sequence, since *Frederick and Basilea* is datable June 3, 1597, while *1 Tamar Cam* belongs to 1602, seemingly late in the year, with the *Battle of Alcazar* fitting in at some point between these extremes. Whatever may be the exact date of the *Battle of Alcazar*, these facts would argue that it, *Fortune's Tennis*, and *1 Tamar Cam* form a group later than *Frederick and Basilea*, June 3, 1597. The reason of this separate grouping in the case of the other two plots is that in the autumn of 1597 Pembroke's company came to coöperate with the Admiral's, thus bringing in many new actors.¹ Presumably the same reason holds for *Fortune's Tennis*. Whatever the explanation, it is hard to see how it could date much, if at all before 1597.

Another less significant point is that Singer is first mentioned with the Admiral's men in a list between entries of December 14, 1594, and January 14, 1595, and could hardly have been a member before the reorganization in the summer 1594.² Thus the plot of *Fortune's Tennis* would appear to date hardly earlier than 1597, and would appear to be wholly impossible for a date before May 12, 1593, as Dr. Tannenbaum must date it.

Since Kyd died before the end of 1594 and under Dr. Tannenbaum's own interpretation would almost certainly not have had any connection with theatrical affairs after May 12, 1593, it would appear impossible that he could have written the plot of *Fortune's Tennis*. But if not that, then the experts, including Dr. Tannenbaum, would assure us not *The Seven Deadly Sins*, nor a part of *More*.

Fortunately, Dr. Tannenbaum's care and acute powers of observation have given us the positive identification of this hand. He points out that "Dr. Greg had noticed (*Shakespeare's Hand*, p. 56) that a few hasty stage directions in the margins of *John-a-Kent* are in the handwriting of C. What he had not noticed (but Miss

¹ *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. xxvi, pp. 82 ff.

² Baldwin, T. W., *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, Appendix I.

Byrne had) is the fact that just about the middle of the wrapper bearing the title there is what Miss Byrne has described, not quite accurately, as the 'scribble of a name, apparently V thomas.' The writing, except the unusually tall English capital V, is now very pale and reads *l g V thomas Thomas* in a penmanship which is unquestionably that of C. It is not unreasonable to assume that these words, being in the handwriting of C. and of the writer of the Puckering letter, are the Christian name of Thomas Kyd, done in an idle moment or while trying out his pen" (p. 48). The first word, of which Dr. Tannenbaum gets only *l* and *g* would appear to be "*legit*." The *e* seems clearly decipherable in Farmer's facsimile, properly spaced and connected to the *g*, with the heavy cross stroke which connects with the left wing of the *V* running through its upper half, and with the end of a line which appears to have been in place when the *l* was made just touching the top of the *e*, these two lines and the dimness having previously obscured the letter. The general outline and possibly the dot of the *i* may also be decipherable. The heavy cross line may have served as the cross of the *t*. The spacing is also correct, though the huge *V* has obscured the last letters by its protecting wing. If the word is *legit*, the phrase means "Thomas (thomas) V has read this," and is the prompter-bookkeeper's docket on the manuscript signifying that it has had his attention, as the other jottings also indicate. There seem to be traces of other writing along the top of the blank space in which C was writing, so that his *l* and his first *thomas* collided with it, in the latter case making such a tangle that *Thomas* was repeated in larger and fairer form. It is highly desirable that an expert examine the original manuscript in the Huntingdon library to see if these conjectures are correct.

Who then was the prompter Thomas V? Taylor, the water poet, tells us in 1638 "I my selfe did know one *Thomas Vincent*, that was a Book-keeper or prompter at the Globe play-house neere the Banck-end in Maid Lane."³ If Taylor is accurate, Vincent was the prompter at some time after the building of the Globe in 1599. He appears as a musician in the plot of *Seven Deadly Sins*, made by him for Strange's men in 1592. Since he was working for the company by 1592 and as late as 1599, we should expect that he had remained continuously with the company. But his writing the fragment of *Fortune's Tennis* for the Admiral's, seemingly not earlier than 1597, as well as his work on *Kent*, which Sir Edmund Chambers dates about December 1594, would seem to indicate that he had really been attached to the Admiral's and not Strange's during the amalgamation, had remained with the Admiral's for a time after the separation, but had eventually gone to the Shak-

³ *Taylor's Feast*, Spenser Society, 3rd Coll. pp. 70-1.

sperean company, presumably before June 3, 1597, when another prompter writes the plot of *Frederick and Basilea* for the Admiral's. It is thus desirable to identify the prompters of the Admiral's men, since facts concerning them may give further clue as to Vincent's service. The present evidence as to Vincent's connection with the Admiral's seems contradictory and must await some more decisive fact to clear it up.

But since Kyd did not write hand C, then Dr. Tannenbaum has no evidence (2) to date the play before May 12, 1593, when Kyd was arrested and removed from possible touch with dramatic affairs, on which depends fundamentally Dr. Tannenbaum's interpretation (3) of the purpose of the play, (4) the reason of its incompleteness, and (5) of Tyllney's refusal to license. Further, this evidence furnishes (6) no instance of Kyd's writing after 1587, (7) nor shows that his patron, and consequently the patron (8) for whom Marlowe and Dekker wrote in the early nineties was Strange. Since Dr. Tannenbaum has failed to distinguish between the hands of Kyd and Vincent, one naturally hesitates to accept his identification of the supposedly atheistic disputation as Kyd's in the face of Kyd's positive denial, and especially when we have no authentic specimens of Marlowe's hand. One fears that the points of likeness are due to the fact that all belong to the same professional type of writing. Yet, even though Dr. Tannenbaum's main conclusions fall, still much of the subsidiary evidence he has marshalled in their support has pertinent bearing on the fundamental questions involved, and must be considered in all future attempts to solve this problem.

While Dr. Tannenbaum makes no claim to any addition on hand D (? Shakspeare's), yet he does advance the theory that this author probably had nothing to do with the original version but was called in to help save the play from the waste basket. From this conclusion, he further infers that the play had not originally belonged to D's company. He "would say that the play was originally written by Mundy, Heywood and Chettle, either for the Admiral's or for Worcester's men, and that on its being returned unlicensed (or even before its rejection by Tyllney) it was sold to Strange's men, whose poets (Kyd, Dekker and D) immediately set about revising it. Their labors were hardly begun, however, when Thomas Kyd was arrested on the grave charge of seditious libel." Such a theory is, I believe, impossible, though there is not space to show why here. At least, in view of the known routine of the time it is unnecessary. For frequently, if not always, companies had "billed" the first performance of a play before it had been licensed, in some cases before it had been completed. At least, the company would have its own tentative schedule of performances. When therefore Tyllney returned the play with a demand for

serious alteration, the company would necessarily muster every man who could patch, and hasten the reformatiions, so as to lose as little time as possible. It is doubtful whether the whole patching process occupied more than an hour of any author's time, say after the play, though poor Vincent probably spent a long and busy evening writing out the fair form or seeing to its being done. Let us hope that he got a successful (box office test) performance as planned and advertised.

Of Dr. Tannenbaum's claims, we now have left the identification of hand A as Henry Chettle's, and hand B as Thomas Heywood's. Dr. Tannenbaum has been able to show some significant coincidences between known specimens of Chettle's hand and hand A, but the inexpert eye will also see sufficient differences to give it pause till the experts have cleared the matter up. It is desirable too that all other known tests for authorship be brought to bear.

In the case of Heywood, Dr. Tannenbaum is pursuing a rejected suggestion of Dr. Greg's, elaborating the likeness between hand B and known specimens of Heywood's writing, and accounting for the differences by the lapse of time, some twenty years between *More* and the next earliest specimen. Dr. Tannenbaum's arguments seem plausible, but again we appeal to the experts.

While this completes the list of Dr. Tannenbaum's formal claims, we have not touched upon some of his most important contributions. Perhaps the most important is his clear demonstration that contrary to general opinion, the revisions were made after the manuscript had been ordered corrected by the Master of the Revels, though possibly only the prompter Vincent, and his boy Shakspeare (if tradition is correct in assigning Shakspeare the task of prompter's attendant, and if D is Shakspeare's writing) took the orders seriously. They were obliged to, or at least Vincent was, since the task of negotiating a license was his, and he was still intending to cast the play. But he did not cast the play on this surviving manuscript. It would have been absurd for him to attempt to do so, since the manuscript was now no longer clear enough for him to follow when actors forgot their parts. Thus Vincent for practical purposes would have been obliged to make, or have made, a fair copy. Besides, Tyllney had not licensed the present manuscript of the play, so that the revision had to be returned for his license. Our nearest parallel here is *Believe As Ye List*, which seems to have been at least as badly slashed by Herbert as was *More* by Tyllney. But Massinger revised, rewrote, and resubmitted the play, which was passed by Herbert after further purging of offensive details that had escaped even the careful Massinger. Too, orders to omit a scene did not mean it should be omitted from the manuscript, but in the acting. For instance, the deposition in *Richard II* seems to have been a censored scene, but it

remained in some manuscript of the play to make its appearance in better days. Besides, if the dramatists did not want to give up the scene wholly, they could but try to adjust it sufficiently to get by Tyllney on the next reading. If they failed, then the prompter could leave it out of the acting version. While then we have no positive evidence that *More* was eventually licensed and played, since the evidence for that would be on the fair copy, yet none of the evidence yet adduced indicates that it was not. Certainly Vincent at the last stage which could be recorded on the present manuscript was intending to have the play performed. And it is to be suspected that he and the dramatists knew Tyllney and his probable reactions to the political situation much better than do we.

But we have not space for all of Dr. Tannenbaum's really noteworthy contributions to this problem of *Sir Thomas More*. No one can afford to overlook his work, and when the final history of the problem is written, it is safe to predict that Dr. Tannenbaum will receive no mean share of the credit for helping to its solution. It is a most hopeful sign for America when a very able layman, as is Dr. Tannenbaum, both can and will devote himself faithfully and energetically to scholarly problems.

T. W. BALDWIN.

University of Illinois.

A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, and to the Romaunt of the Rose. By JOHN S. P. TATLOCK and ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. The Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1927. xiii + 1111 pages.

The long-awaited concordance to Chaucer, though a portly volume, would have seemed disappointingly small to Dr. Flügel, whose magnificent plans for a "glossarial concordance" were illustrated before his death by specimen extracts printed in *Anglia* (xxxiv, 354-422; xxxvii, 497-532). But, as the editors of the present concordance point out in their introduction, Flügel was really undertaking a dictionary of Middle English on a scale more elaborate than that of any lexicon hitherto published. Yet it was a dictionary limited to that part of the vocabulary that happened to occur in Chaucer. Valuable as such a dictionary would have been for our understanding of Chaucer, a work of such amplitude on a single author would hardly be justified at a time when no adequate Middle English dictionary exists, and when Chaucer, however much he may tower above his contemporaries, is no longer considered the only begetter of standard English. The editors note (p. xii) that "through the loyalty and public-spirit of his [Flügel's] heirs, his entire manuscript and collections were transferred in 1925 to Cor-

nell University, to be used for the newly projected dictionary of Middle English; under happier stars, it is to be hoped, than those of the 'Glossarial Concordance' projected in 1871." The publication of the present concordance in less than a decade after it had been begun is proof of the wisdom of the editors' decision to start anew with fresh materials, and to abandon any attempt to carry on the older work.

We may expect that a concordance be complete, accurate, and convenient; and the Concordance to Chaucer fulfills all these requirements. The editors have anticipated the difficulties that a new edition of Chaucer might engender by including copious variant readings. The true test of their judgment in this matter will be the next critical edition of a part or the whole of Chaucer's works. But the text of Chaucer is even now in a better state than that of many a modern poet, and the generosity of the compilers in recording variants makes it unlikely that the present concordance will ever become antiquated, even in detail. For example, in the case of *babewynnes* (OF. *babuins*), an almost certain emendation in the *House of Fame*, 3. 99: "Of babewynnes and pynacles," three variant readings of the manuscripts are listed—*babeuries*, *babewryes*, and *babeweuries*; other variants, such as *rabewynnes*, and *rabewyures*, are rightly disregarded.

The Concordance is based on the "Globe" edition, which is less familiar than Skeat's text, but has the advantage of being more conservative. One may look up hundreds of lines from Skeat's text in the Concordance, and discover no difference other than a minor variation in spelling and an occasional "which that" of Skeat for a "that" of the "Globe" edition. The chief source of confusion is likely to be in cases where other editors make a division of words different from that in the "Globe" edition. Thus in *Troilus*, iv, 1411: "Whan he for-fered out of Delphos sterte," Skeat and Root have *for fered*, a reading which would make another entry under *feared*. In general, the decision to spell the head-words in modern English makes the concordance independent not only of the vagaries of Middle English scribes, but of the whims and frailties of editors.

Like most concordance-makers, Professors Tatlock and Kennedy have been obliged to give only specimens of the commonest words. The selection of specimens, a particularly delicate task in the case of a poet whose conjunctions and prepositions are so subtly different from our own, has been admirably done. Under *at* I miss the meaning *apud*, as in "For I have ben right now at Deiphebus" (*Troilus*, II, 1480), the predecessor of our modern *at* with the possessive. "I have be shryven this day at my curat" (*D. Sum.* 2095) is ambiguous. Under *the* I miss the article with days of the week (cf. Eienkel, *Streifzüge durch die Mittelenenglische Syntax*, p. 5) as in "Selde is the Friday all the wowke y-like" (*A. Kn.* 1539).

The Concordance is accurate as well as complete. The reviewer has discovered no incorrect references and only one misprint in using it frequently and testing it systematically over a period of six months. This is a tribute both to the editors and the workers who helped them in making the slips. The maker of a concordance, like the modern general, must be judged not only by his own work, but by his ability to organize and supervise the work of others.

The usual practice of concordances has been followed in listing homonyms together. One who, like the reviewer, has had little or no experience in the making of a concordance, is not altogether convinced of the wisdom or necessity of this plan. Must the burden of separating "rose," the flower, from "rose," the verb, and "bear," the animal, from "bear," the verb, be shifted from the compiler to the reader? Professor Lane Cooper estimated that 'a lexical concordance to Wordsworth with an equal number of references would require a volume probably one-third or one-half as large again' as his concordance to Wordsworth (*Concordance . . . to Wordsworth*, p. vii). All who buy concordances will agree that in the case of Wordsworth and Chaucer it would have been unwise to undertake a lexical concordance such as Ellis compiled for Shelley. But is the separation of unrelated homonyms in a language so confusingly full of them as English an encroachment on the lexicographer's function? According to my own estimate, based on the homonyms under the letter B, three more pages would have sufficed for the separation of all the unrelated homonyms in the book. There is really no conflict of principle, for the editors have separated homonyms "for special reasons." By this plan such unhappy collocations as "He mighte doon us bathe a vileynye" and "Faire in the soond, to bathe hire myrily" might be avoided; while "burst," noun and verb, might be kept together.

To be sure, the difficulty of ferreting out the right homonym, for the scholarly reader, at least, is not enormous. But it increases the reader's troubles in the case of a Middle English writer whose words are recorded under their modern spellings. The editors, after experimenting with head-words in mediaeval spelling, adopted the modern spelling because of the lack of a standard Chaucerian orthography. This method is unquestionably the right one; yet it introduces certain complications and anomalies. Since homonyms are listed together, it often happens that what were not homonyms to Chaucer appear together: thus two such different forms as *liggen* and *lye* are found under *lie*; and *egg*, 'incite,' and *ey*, 'egg,' are found under *egg*. Conversely, words that were homonyms to Chaucer are listed separately: M.E. *trewe*, 'truce,' and M.E. *trewe*, 'true'; M.E. *sterie* 'start,' and *sterte* 'started.' More important is the fact that the reader must occasionally, in the case of homonyms, go through two processes: first he must determine the

Modern English equivalent of Chaucer's word, and then he must search through the collection of homonyms for the particular word he is after. Desiring to look up Chaucer's use of *bote*, 'remedy,' he must stop to think whether it is a modern word or not, and having found it under *boot*, he must disentangle it from *boot* 'bit.' The two processes thus 'encressen double wise the peynes stronge' of the reader intent on finding every occurrence of a word in Chaucer.

The problem of deciding whether a Chaucerian word is to be equated with a modern one is in itself no easy task. This is especially true of words that have been modified since Chaucer's time in the direction of their etymological originals. Thus *augrim*, *aunter*, *auntrous*, are under their Middle English forms, not under *algorism*, *adventure*, *adventurous*; but *avowtrie*, the only form used by Chaucer, is to be found, strangely enough, under *adultery* (without cross-reference). A similar difficulty arises in the case of the past tenses of verbs which have undergone analogical transformation since Chaucer's time. The past tense of strong verbs which have become weak in modern English is to be found under the Chaucerian strong form: *heelp* (including *holp*, *halp*) not *helped*, *wex* not *waxed*; and when Chaucer already has weak forms as well as strong, under both: *weep*, *wept*. When the past tense of a strong verb has a different strong form in modern English, however, it is usually to be found under the modern form: *stal* is under *stole* (the only Chaucerian *stole* being the noun); but the contrary is true of *boot*, which is itself the heading, not *bit*. The forms of the third class of strong verbs have been especially troublesome to classify. The reader who looks for Chaucer's form under the ordinary modern English past tense will find that he is right in the case of *drank*, *ran*, *sang*, and *won*; but under *rang* he will find a cross-reference to *rung*, under which is listed both *rong* (= *rang*) and *rongen* (= *rung*, pret. pl. and past part.). This apparent inconsistency seems to be the result of the fact that there are no preterit singulars actually spelled *rang*. In the case of some verbs, where the preterit plural differs widely from the singular, the two forms are sometimes separated, as under *rode* and *riden* (another heading *ride* for present and infinitive); and sometimes not, as in *chose*, which includes both *chees* sg. and *chose* pl. The editors rightly remark (p. vi) that 'sometimes the logical thing to do is misleading and inconvenient for everybody, and sometimes the convenient thing is unscientific.' But it is occasionally hard to tell whose convenience they have in mind, the general reader's, the professed student's, or merely their own.

These slight inconsistencies, avoidable and unavoidable, must not be exaggerated. Fortunately they are seldom of practical moment, for the editors provide numerous cross-references. With

a little thought and a little turning of the leaves, everything may be found. Probably the concordance or glossary was never made that had enough cross-references to satisfy the demands of every reader. 'Yaf see gave,' should be paralleled by 'yate see gate.' *Gronte* should be listed, with a reference to *grunted*, especially since the reader is apt to be deceived by Skeat, who defined it 'groaned.' The reader unacquainted with Old English who looks up *rive* might easily miss the preterit *rove*, for there is no cross-reference.

The above comments will be considered, I hope, rather as a measure of the difficulties encountered by the editors, than as carp-ing criticism of their work. Certainly no compiler of an English concordance of this type has had to make so many decisions and solve so many problems as Professors Tatlock and Kennedy. Their difficult task is well done. It is hardly necessary to mention the great value of the Concordance to all lovers of Chaucer. If such a problem as the authorship of the various parts of the *Romaunt of the Rose* can ever be definitely settled, it is likely to be through the use of this volume. But apart from questions of scholarship, the Concordance is a boon to those who delight in pursuing the poet's 'favorite words' and in comparing his diction with that of his illustrious successors in English poetry.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, by CHARLES HOMER HASKINS. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. x + 437.

This book should appeal to all students of modern languages and to all humanists as well as to mediaevalists. It treats of a period important for every person interested in the history of Western civilization; it presents topics of immediate and pertinent significance; it is written by a distinguished mediaeval scholar internationally recognized not only for the quality of his independent investigations, but also for his comprehensiveness of grasp and wisdom in selections of materials and for his soundness of judgment in evaluating them. On the small, select shelf which holds *A primer of Medieval Latin* and *Speculum* this new volume takes its place as an indispensable *vade mecum* for every young aspirant to mediaeval studies.

The book concerns one century of the Middle Ages, a period characterized despite popular conception to the contrary by "much eager search after knowledge and beauty, much creative accomplishment in art, in literature, in institutions." The author

selects for treatment the twelfth century, the period of the third renaissance of the Middle Ages, following in the sequence of the Carolingian renaissance of the ninth century and the Ottonian renaissance of the tenth century. But he finds no abrupt break, for he posits the term *renaissance* as meaning only a more distinct accentuation of forces which contribute constantly to continuity and change through all periods. Even in crowded summary, this century commands respect and stands the test of comparison with more recent ages:

The epoch of the Crusades, of the rise of towns, and of the earliest bureaucratic states of the West, it saw the culmination of Romanesque art and the beginnings of Gothic; the emergence of the vernacular literatures; the revival of the Latin classics and of Latin poetry and Roman law; the recovery of Greek science, with its Arabic additions, and of much of Greek philosophy; and the origin of the first European universities. The twelfth century left its signature on higher education, on the scholastic philosophy, on European systems of law, on architecture and sculpture, on the liturgical drama, on Latin and vernacular poetry,

Mr. Haskins writes as a humanist interested in the intellectual and æsthetic aspects of the century as revealed through the Latin writings of the period. His aim is to present in outline a history of culture in the twelfth century, exclusive of architecture, sculpture, and vernacular writings. To this end, he projects against the background of earlier cultural history and the intellectual centres as represented by monasteries, cathedrals, and courts, chapters upon Books and Libraries, Revival of Latin Classics, Latin Language, Latin Poetry, Revival of Jurisprudence, Historical Writing, The Translators from Greek and Arabic, Revival of Science, Revival of Philosophy, and The Beginnings of Universities. A carefully selected bibliographical note accompanies each chapter. In a sense, each section is a complete essay and "may be considered in some degree as independent of the rest." To the reviewer, the divisions according to this topical method appear logically maintained except in the chapter on the Latin Language, which is primarily a treatment of grammar and rhetoric. Here a brief discussion of exempla, and some bibliographical references to Latin poetry tend to take the reader afield. Since the purpose of the book is to enable us to approximate seeing the humanistic aspects of the age as a whole, the reviewer regrets that Mr. Haskins felt obliged to exclude Architecture, Sculpture, and Vernacular Literature.

Probably the distinctive contribution in the volume is the discussion of the revival of science through Greek and Arabic translators, an approach for which we are indebted to the independent investigations of the author himself. As he emphasizes, the renaissance of the twelfth century had to do primarily with philosophy and science. Its modernity in certain respects comes home to us in connection with the classical revival of the period: "At its

best it [the classical revival] stood for a harmonious and balanced type of culture in which literature and logic both had a place, but which was hostile to the professional and technical spirit that triumphed in the new universities." And here let us pause to emphasize for the modernist that "the university is a mediaeval contribution to civilization and more specifically a contribution of the twelfth century." The author's discussion of the question of intellectual liberty, under *The Revival of Philosophy*, and his arguments to show the comparative freedom of the thinker lead the reviewer to the general conclusion that the boundaries of freedom of thought are always reached when one goes contrary to the interests, prejudices, or convictions of the period. In the twelfth century, theology was the forbidden ground.

In a journal devoted to the modern languages a word concerning the author's style is pertinent. Mr. Haskins writes a firm, sinewy prose, shorn of verbiage, illustrating in its totality the virtues of compactness, clarity, vigor, power, grace, and ease; a model for all graduate students in the humanities. And woven into this texture are passages characterized by vividness and beauty, such as his description of Mont-Saint-Michel:

Few spots are by nature so set apart for monastic seclusion and religious meditation as this remote rock, cut off from the mainland by tide and shifting sands, and looking out past stormy Breton headlands to the pathless ocean where the sun of mortal life goes down in death.

This book represents a task which needed to be done. We are fortunate in having it done by a scholar rather than by a dilettante. Perchance we shall interpret him rightly through the closing words of Hallam's preface to a similar theme written over a century ago: "My labours will not have proved fruitless, if they shall conduce to stimulate the reflection, to guide the researches, to correct the prejudices, or to animate the liberal and virtuous sentiments of inquisitive youth."

GEORGE R. COFFMAN.

Boston University.

A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I. By ASTA KIHLOM. Uppsala (A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln) and London (David Nutt), 1926. xxxi+203 pp.

This inaugural dissertation, prepared under the direction of Professor Zachrisson, follows the investigations of Morsbach, Lekebusch, and Fladbeck of the elevation of the London dialect to the position of an official language during the 15th and early 16th centuries. This thesis studies the extent to which "the

London usage during this early period was felt as a Standard for the written language in general, such as it was used in, for instance, private communications written by private persons in various parts of England" (p. vii). The published portion of the work deals only with the stressed vowels in words of Germanic origin; a later part will deal with the words of French origin, with consonants, and with the vowels of unstressed syllables.

The sources examined are original letters (rather than those signed by a secretary, whose dialect may be markedly different from that of the signatory) written by well identified persons. As far as was possible in view of the lack of original 15th century letters from the Midland or the North, letters from all parts of England were studied. The social position of each writer was noted and other circumstances that might aid the student in estimating the philological value of the various spellings. The material examined consists of the Paston Letters (Norfolk), the Stonor Letters (Oxfordshire), the Cely Papers (London), the letters of John Shillingford (Devon), and of Edmund de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk.

The main body of the book comprises a detailed and systematic study of the development of each Old English stressed vowel as it appears in the documents studied. In the "discussion" appended to the treatment of each vowel the general student of the English language will find the comments that will be of most interest to him. For instance, *ar* for earlier M. E. *er* is more frequent in these private papers than in the writings of official scribes, who would know and use the traditional spellings even after the sounds they represented had changed. Again, many peculiarities of modern dialects appear in these 15th century documents and are thus shown to be much earlier in origin than has commonly been supposed. The prothetic *y* or *w* developed in such words as *yelm*, *yetts*, *yearth*, *woothe*, *woam* dialect forms of *helm*, *oats*, *earth*, *oath*, and *home* is still preserved in the modern dialect forms of these words.

The conclusion of this study is what was to be expected: the language of these private papers agrees with the official London usage not only in general features, but also in minute details. "It is evident that the London language was felt as a Standard to be followed as closely as possible, and the dialectal deviations that do occur are more or less occasional and generally appear by the side of the 'Standard' forms" (p. 193). The point is made also that the influence of the eastern dialects on the spoken language of London was very strong and that it was through the channel of the Eastern area (the speech of which was more vulgar and colloquial than London speech of the same period) that Northern forms penetrated into the speech of London. More emphasis should have been placed upon the fact that these private papers are

much more modern in their usage than the official documents and that these letters contain the earliest examples of many of the features of the modern English dialects.

J. M. STEADMAN, JR.

Emory University.

America and French Culture, 1750-1848. By HOWARD MUMFORD JONES. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1927. xiii + 615 pp. \$5.00.

The value of this volume is two-fold: first, as an exposition of a practical method for the student of comparative literature to investigate our cultural origins; second, as a pioneer survey of the manifold aspects of French civilization in America from 1750 to 1848. This is the first of two parts; the forthcoming one is to discuss the reception of French literature during the same period, and, if it will exploit the periodicals systematically, its importance will be admittedly great. Professor Jones considers in turn the three main elements that have shaped American culture: "The Cosmopolitan spirit, Frontier spirit, Bourgeois or Middle-Class spirit." With these dynamic forces as a background, the author passes in review American reactions to French migration, language, manners, art, religion, philosophy, and politics. Fortunately, careful distinction is made between interest in France and French influence. The author makes no pretense at having produced a definitive work, and announces unsparingly—but justly—the following deficiencies:

I have had to generalize in many instances from insufficient data and I have had to make long running jumps in various parts of the field, to guess when I wanted to know and to surmise when I would have preferred to prove.

No one, the writer says, has tried to see *The General American attitude* toward things French. Perhaps so—but his attempt to discover one constitutes an *a priori* judgment; besides, he does not sustain this general attitude with convincing proof. The reader will judge for himself whether the outlook of the frontier toward French culture had much in common with that of the Brahmins of Boston. A striking analogy is brought to mind between this work and Taine's *History of English Literature*. Like the latter, Jones has also the problem of culling only such material from a vast storehouse as corroborates the three fundamental factors established at the outset.

If the endeavor to glimpse at French culture from all aspects is a praiseworthy one, it is not always practical or wise. Of necessity, the chapters are of unequal merit. That on the French language in America (most of which had already appeared in *SP.*) is an excellent one, as are those on manners, philosophy, and education. As much cannot be said of the last two, which concern France and our politics; in fact, the book might have gained had the author refrained from discussing a topic so often treated. The first of these chapters leans heavily on the admirable monograph of Bernard Fay; the second is superficial. J. might profitably have consulted Miss E. B. White, *American Opinion of France from Lafayette to Poincaré* (New York, Knopf, 1927), had her work appeared a little earlier. The well-meaning ambition to envisage all phases of a civilization must seem a bit extravagant in view of the fact that he has nothing to say of the economic or scientific aspects. Even a glance at our earlier XIXth century periodical literature betrays a profound interest in what is called the golden age of French science with Cuvier, LaPlace, Lagrange, and no dearth of others. The omission of the scientific aspect must appear more grave when we recall the following sentence:

It is not too much to say that in the first half of the XIX century most of the scientific text-books in use in American schools and colleges derived directly or indirectly from the French (p. 484).

But the stoutest criticism will give way before much that is admirable in the book. The text is well buttressed with references. The style is condensed, but none the less lively. To be lucid while endeavoring to show the play of a changing French culture against a rich American background is difficult indeed; but J. is to be commended for revealing the complexity of the elements that enter into our national life. The occasional summaries of preceding chapters (pp. 73, 215, 385, 567) are, thus, at once helpful and necessary since he is desirous of keeping before the reader the vicissitudes of French ideas in regard to each of the dominant American "spirits" or forces. The bibliography is opulent, but uncritical. In the impressive list of magazines, the author should have indicated the place of publication so that the section of public opinion represented might better be determined. All in all, we insist upon the significance of this volume. It has crystalized a great mass of literature relating to our contacts with France from 1750-1848, "... in the hundred years we were closest to that interesting people"; it has formulated a program for future students of the field that will doubtless further research; it has made some use, at least, of periodicals; it is, finally, the first courageous incursion on a generous scale into this attractive subject by an

American scholar. The author could not hope to have accomplished more.¹

MAURICE CHAZIN.

Johns Hopkins University.

Zigzags autour de nos parlers. Par LOUIS-PHILIPPE GEOFFRION.
Quebec, 125 rue de la Claire-Fontaine. Vol. I, 1925, 222 pp.;
vol. II, 1925, 229 pp.; vol. III, 1927, 230 pp.

As the title suggests, this work contains the results of discursive rambles, which the author made in the realm of French Canadian language. Within the compass of these three volumes we find a study of the origins and history of some 340 vocables or idioms in use among the French of the Province of Quebec. This contribution to French philology, in the form of detached notes published in Canadian newspapers, presents the hybrid character of a work whose author is both dilettante and apologist. Indeed, he seems to have cherished the hope of writing a *Défense et Illustration* of the local language. There is no organization whatever of the subject-matter. He is satisfied with tracing back the history of words or idioms in current usage among his people by means of numerous quotations from mediæval, modern, and contemporary French authors. From the scientific standpoint, one will certainly regret that the explanations are confined to French rather than comparative Romance philology. Such limitation of scope renders impossible the clearing up of obscure points which might otherwise have been elucidated. The information contained is generally sound and valuable even if, in certain cases, explanations are far-fetched and not very convincing. For instance, in connection with the entries *brayer*, *braye* (I, 26); *torchon*, *guipon* (I, 61), much overworked analogy has furnished M. Geoffrion with remarks which are ingenious but decidedly questionable. Furthermore, it might be better to consider the omission of *de* and the definite article in *Rue Claire-Fontaine* (II, 136) a remnant of the old genitive case rather than the result of the contamination of the proper noun *La Fontaine* and the common noun *fontaine*. A more serious objection has to be made to the author's thesis concerning Anglicisms.

¹ The delicacy of pronouncing final judgments on our intellectual debt to France will become evident when we compare the conclusions of Mr. J. and Miss White, whose recent work was referred to above. According to her, French influence has been great. For Mr. J., France has had vogue rather than influence (p. 572). So that we are left to the sorrowful observation once made by Ammianus Marcellinus: The work has still to be done.

Of all the parasites dangerous to French speech in Canada, English words or constructions, creeping into everyday language, are most to be feared. For the last half century purists have been intent upon eradicating them. Some of these purists, overzealous in their task, saw traces of English where none were to be found. M. G. finds much satisfaction in referring to the errors of his predecessors in this direction but he himself makes deductions which are open to criticism. Failing to take into consideration that modern usage is the criterion of standard French, he sees French survivals and not anglicisms in those French Canadian words which can be traced back to old vocables which were taken over into English before they died out in French. In a country where English and French are spoken side by side, one cannot affirm so unhesitatingly that *plombeur*: *plombier* (I, 98); *grosserie*, *grosneur*: *épicerie*, *épicier* (II, 174); *bâdrer*: *ennuyer*, *vexer*, *contrarier* (II, 213); *bède*: *lit* (III, 189), are survivals from the older language rather than English influences. For additional examples of anglicisms, cf. *argents* (I, 6); *anxieux de* (I, 57); *réaliser* (I, 64); *monter sur le banc* (I, 153); *identifier*, *identification* (I, 156); *banqueter* (I, 177); *bargaine* (I, 192); *dépêche des affaires* (II, 37); *payer*, *être payant* (II, 64); *flasque* (II, 112); *clair* (II, 93); *examen de témoin*, *examiner un témoin* (II, 112); *cloque* (II, 144); *jugement renversé* (II, 161); *dans la ligne de* (II, 170); *ponce* (III, 13); *cope* (III, 73). Since these vocables or expressions are found in old French texts or in modern authors, M. Geoffrion does not consider them anglicisms. He also attempts to justify obsolete words or idioms on the ground that they are used by good writers or found in standard dictionaries. But the employment of unusual vocables or constructions by reputable authors does not necessarily vouch for their conformity to the genius of the language. On the other hand, Littré, Bescherelle, or Hatzfeld and Darmesteter register the most common usages without, for that, approving or condemning them. Ample bibliographical references precede vol. I; however, one may wonder why the author has not thought it fit to refer either in the bibliography or in the body of the work to the contributions of Clapin, Dionne, and Blanchard, which deal specifically with the French Canadian speech.

Such as they are, in spite of their limitations, the *Zigzags* can be considered one of the most extensive studies ever published on the subject. We may point out that the first two volumes were crowned by the French Academy and the Quebec government. In his capacity of Secretary of the *Société du Parler Français au Canada*, the author had access to the best of sources, the great wealth of information collected in view of the publication of an exhaustive glossary of the local language. Although not a work of philological synthesis, the specialist will undoubtedly find in

these three volumes a considerable amount of valuable material which may be used with profit in the scientific treatment of this special field of French philology.

J. M. CARRIÈRE.

Marquette University.

Anatole France, the Parisian. By HERBERT LESLIE STEWART.
New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1927. xiv + 394 pp.

This handsome and well-printed volume of some 400 pages is a serious study of Anatole France. It scarcely lives up to its title, however. Chapter II is indeed entitled "The Child of Paris," but the rest of the book has little direct bearing on the subject. Child of Paris Anatole France certainly was in many ways, but in so far as Professor Stewart's work is concerned, he comes nearer the mark when, near the end of his study, he refers to France as "a cultured pagan of classical antiquity, who had chanced to be born in Paris" (p. 375).

The book as a whole hardly conveys the impression that the author has a sufficient knowledge of French literature to provide an adequate background for his work. Instances of this lack of background are not infrequent. The time-honored misquotation of Montaigne, "pillow of doubt," is given (p. 222). (Montaigne said: "l'incuriosité," which, as was long ago pointed out, is the very opposite of doubt.) Leconte de Lisle's tremendous *Poèmes barbares* are dubbed "graceful" (p. 41). We are informed that La Bruyère was not a member of the Académie and that Daudet unsuccessfully applied for admission (p. 84). Zola is termed, without reservation, "this realist" (p. 246). Nor has the author always understood what he has read in or about France. *Craigneville*, a masterpiece, is misappreciated to fit the purpose of the chapter "The Sceptic as Social Reformer" (p. 131). The point of the conclusion of *Thais* is missed or misstated (p. 250)—again, perhaps, to fit a theory. The statement about Ronsard and the 19th century (p. 383) is in flat contradiction of what France really wrote and of the facts. In matters of history, the Republic was considerably more than "twenty" years old in 1897 (p. 111), and the dreadful charity bazaar fire of 1897 was not in a "cinema theatre." (p. 231). Finally, it is difficult to believe that Anatole France, born in 1844, had "often seen" Chateaubriand, who died in 1848 (p. 39).

Errors in the forms of French words, while slight, are unnecessarily frequent. Following common mistakes, the name Sully Prudhomme is endowed with a superfluous hyphen (p. 84) and those of Heredia (p. 41) and Clemenceau (passim) with equally

superfluous acute accents. On the other hand, Micromégas (p. 228) and conséquence (p. 264) lose theirs, while Saint-Germain-des-Près (p. 52) twice masquerades as "Près." Chateaubriand's *Itinéraire* is pluralized through a misunderstanding (p. 39). The author has a trick of using French words—*préfet*, *régime*, *libre penseur*—where good English equivalents exist. The horrendous *nom-de-plume*, neither French nor English, mars p. 326. Cousin's *Du vrai, du beau et du bien* is quoted as *Le vrai, le beau, le bon* (p. 356). The only English misprint noted is *book* for *took* (p. 292).

A serious defect in Professor Stewart's work is the implicit confidence that he seems to put in the chatter of Brousson, the dismissed secretary of France, while Gsell's far more serious book is utilized comparatively little. He calls Brousson "very candid" (p. 159); other epithets might easily occur to the reader of this *chronique scandaleuse*. (In a recent review, Paul Souday says of this and a succeeding volume: "The two volumes of M. Brousson are simply a work of vindictive hatred. Nothing could be more malicious, more venomous, more questionable.") The author would have been wise to bear in mind the remark of France, quoted by Brousson himself in his preface: "Il y a là-dessous bien de la perversité." Over-reliance on Brousson has perhaps somewhat warped the author's attitude towards the *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc*. It is hardly just to attribute the writing of this history primarily to anti-clerical propaganda; Anatole France's life-long interest in Jeanne is part and parcel of his general interest in the lives of saints and in the lowly and simple-minded.

This book is the work of a professor of philosophy, not of a student of French literature. As such, it is a serious, useful, and, on the whole, sympathetic study of its subject. One gets the impression in reading it that the author likes Anatole France more than he really feels that he should. Unashamed lovers of Anatole France can pardon errors of detail and some injustices in view of the finely appreciative sentence, too long to quote in full, beginning: "One should not lightly disparage . . . a character which gave such notable proof of some of the highest human virtues" (p. 359).

GEO. N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

Pour et contre le romanisme. Bibliographie des travaux publiés de 1914 à 1926. By HENRI GIRARD ET HENRI MONCEL. (Etudes françaises fondées sur l'initiative de la Société des professeurs français en Amérique. 11e cahier.) Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1927. 94 pp.

This bibliography is limited to books written in French and published in book-form. Periodical literature and critical matter written in other languages than the French are, with very few exceptions, carefully eschewed. The three books written in English (Nos. 34, 36, 39), which appear in the section "Influences étrangères," and which form an exception in this all-French bibliography, are at least published on French soil. Of these three, only the last, E. Partridge's thesis, *The French Romantics' Knowledge of English Literature*, fits into this bibliography. Miss Gilman's dissertation, *Othello in French*, might be allowed, inasmuch as it treats in part with Romantic imitations and adaptations of the Shakespearean play, but how can we justify the presence of Clark's book on *Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England* (No. 34) in a list of books dealing with English influence exerted on French Romanticism? Biographical and critical studies of English and German writers, such as Byron (Nos. 41 and 42) and Lavater (No. 30) might be tolerated inasmuch as these books probably also deal, though incidentally, with the influence which these foreign authors exerted on French Romanticism, although the compilers should have given the pagination for those parts of the books listed which have a bearing on the subject, but we fail to comprehend what a book such as *Gæthe en Angleterre* (No. 29) is doing in a section dealing with Germany's influence in France. Neither is it clear what induced the authors to list Professor Reynaud's *Histoire générale de l'influence française en Allemagne* (No. 31) under this rubric, for it is devoted to German influence in France and not to French influence in Germany. The compilers came once out of their exclusiveness and included a study on Théophile Gautier written in French, though published beyond the French frontiers (No. 290).

M. Baldensperger has written a preface for the book, in which he defines the "message" of Romanticism for the present generation. The compilers themselves present, in an Introduction, the contemporary controversy between the admirers and adversaries of Romanticism. In their eagerness to claim victory for Romanticism, they often overshoot the mark. It is doubtful whether the foundation of the Victor Hugo Chair at the Sorbonne could be interpreted as a triumph for the school of which he was the spokesman.¹

¹ The first incumbent of the Victor Hugo Chair was, by the way,

The book under review is almost free from typographical errors.² Notwithstanding its deficiencies, it is a very important bibliographical contribution to the Romantic period, for which all students of the subject should feel deeply grateful.

MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

Baker University.

Germany Ten Years After. By GEORGE H. DANTON. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1928. Pp. x + 295. \$3.50.

Mr. Danton's book is the result of a year's residence and travel in Germany. He condenses his impressions and observations in seven chapters, which—although necessarily overlapping here and there but on the whole well rounded in their presentation—take up definite problems such as political and economic reactions, the schools, the universities, etc. The first chapter strikes the dominant cords, varied throughout the book: counteraction against years of intellectual isolation, taxation and lack of funds, 'Abbau,' attainments and shortcomings of the reorganization in progress. Through constant comparison with conditions in the orient and in America the author succeeds in throwing the peculiar character of the German people and their institutions into relief and a keen and yet sympathetic eye enables him to distribute light and shadow with accuracy and justice as far as an evaluating study, which does not aim at giving historical evolution, permits.

Allowance must, of course, be made for present unsettled conditions, leaving room for divergent interpretation and prognostication. The best chapters are, no doubt, those on the universities and schools, which stress the spirit of seriousness, thoroughness, and responsibility still pervading the whole system of German educational institutions as well as the attitude of their teachers and students. In regard to the pedagogical methods of academic teachers a more frankly critical reaction, to my mind, would not have been amiss. The secondary schools have realized their task and are actually trying to lessen the gap between their upper grades and the first university year while no relief has yet been attempted from above. If Mr. Danton prefers the shortcomings of

Fernand Gregh and not the Catholic poet, Henri Ghéon, as has been erroneously stated by Professor Albert Schinz in his article on French literature in the *International Year-Book* for 1928.

²A serious misprint will be noted in Baldensperger's quotations from Goethe: "Le classique est le saint (read: sain), le romantique est le malade."

the German system he seems to overlook the fact that we are trying to remedy our own through splitting off the senior college and attaching it more closely to the graduate school. A compromise between the German and the American plan, such as Lamprecht had in mind, would largely eliminate the present difficulties.

The reforms in German secondary schools have only to a degree been put into practice, not merely on account of the economic stress but also due to the fact that the Germans (here as in every other phase of reorganization and re-orientation) proceed from the bottom up and not from the surface down. They do not (as frequently our pedagogues) begin to experiment light-heartedly, but the whole structure must rest on the solid basis of a changed spiritual outlook. Excellent theoretical preparations have been instituted, their realization, however, will also depend on the convictions of a new generation of teachers. For the feeling of educational responsibility has an almost religious note in it, which would make a German consider the usual religious frills of an American commencement exercise, such as invocation and benediction, as derogatory to the sacredness of his own calling.

It is hard for the American, on the other hand, to understand the solemn and serious attitude of the young people in Germany toward the youth movement, which Mr. Danton underestimates considerably, owing, no doubt, to the enormous difficulty in getting a clear conception of this problem from the contradictory aims and organizations, evidenced in all pertaining publications and manifestations. And there exists a similar difficulty in the sounding of contemporary German literature, the currents of which are still very elusive. Von der Leyen's, Naumann's, Witkop's, Diebold's recent publications and other studies might have furnished Mr. Danton with clearer conceptions of the trend in which the younger movements are developing. Werfel and Jahnn, at any rate, should not have been consistently misspelled as Werfels and Jahn.

German acting, it seems to me, must needs deviate from American ways on account of the evolution toward the idealistic and typifying presentation, which more and more crowds psychological and individualizing methods into the background. It is not the heritage of Goethe's tradition surviving but a new development which reverts to a different form.

As to Shakespeare performance it may hardly be called 'slight' in comparison with twenty-odd years ago. The *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* of 1906 records 1258 presentations by 186 theaters for 1906 as against 1683 by 169 theaters in 1926, and 1905 by 181 theaters in 1925; 23 different works with *A Midsummer-Nights Dream* (364 times), *The Merchant of Venice* (151 times) and *Othello* (105 times) heading the list in 1906; *Twelfth Night* (236 times), *The*

Taming of the Shrew (208 times), and *Othello* (189 times) heading the list of the 28 dramas in 1926. I doubt whether any other country can equal that.

But to turn back to the general tenor of the study and its merits, I wish to emphasize once more the great difficulty of obtaining entirely accurate information on every phase of its discussion. Without a certain courage of braving blunders such a book could not be written. It will prove helpful and stimulating to the general reader as well as to the teacher of German.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Ordbog over det danske Sprog, grundlagt af VERNER DAHLERUP.

Femte Bind, Flyve-Frette; Sjette Bind, Fri-Gramvægt;
Syvende Bind, Gran-Herpaa; Ottende Bind, Herre-Høvævl;
Niende Bind, I-Kansler. Copenhagen, 1923-1927. Gyldendalske Boghandel.

It is good to record the fact that the great Danish dictionary is proceeding steadily and bids fair to be done within a reasonable term of years. In this respect it compares favorably with the *Oxford Dictionary*, and even more so, of course, with the German and Swedish efforts at monumental dictionaries of their respective tongues. The sponsors of the Danish project wisely made their goal modest enough to be attainable within a lifetime. The dictionary is not so exhaustive as that being got by the Swedish Academy, but it is much further along!

The beginnings of the Danish *Ordbog* reach pretty far back, it is true. Verner Dahlerup began his collections as early as 1882, although it was not until 1901 that the Gyldendalske Boghandel persuaded him to sign a contract to prepare a dictionary for the general public. From 1901 to 1915 the collection of material proceeded, but it became more and more clear that the work would have to be put on a broader basis if it was to succeed, and in 1915 the Danske Sprog og Litteraturselskab took over the enterprise. With the increase in funds, and in the number of workers, that this change involved, it became possible to set up and put through a practical program. The first half-volume, consisting of columns 1 to 640, was published in 1918, the second half-volume, with columns 641 to 1184, followed in 1919, and, beginning with the year 1920, a whole volume has come out each year.

The earlier volumes were brought out under the general supervision of Verner Dahlerup, but the volumes under review belong

to a later period in which the general editorship rests in the hands of a board of editors, of whom H. Juul-Jensen and Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen need special mention. One can only stand back and marvel at their achievement. The accuracy, clarity and conciseness of the lexicographer of today are beyond all praise, and the Danish *Ordbog* measures up to the high standards of the present, thanks to the labors of the editors and printers, who know what to do and do it. By way of contrast, I may be permitted to quote the first article of the 1870 Dictionary of the Swedish Academy:

A, bland alla ljud det första, klaraste och skonaste, innehar främsta rummet i de flesta alfabet.

The progress of science since those days is evident!

And yet the reviewer is never to be satisfied! In looking over these weighty and closely packed pages, I have often wished that typographical devices had been more freely used to aid the reader in his search for the particular thing he is looking for. Variations in the size of type, paragraphing and the like doubtless add a good deal to the expense of publication, but they are a boon when the article under scrutiny is long and made up (as a long article usually is) of a large number of items.

But it would be ungrateful to dwell on such points. The *Ordbog* is a work of great distinction, and its editors and publishers deserve generous recognition for their successful prosecution of an enterprise so exacting in its requirements and so meager in its material rewards. Let us see to it that the spiritual rewards, so far as we can give any, are all the greater.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske.

Additions 1913-26. Compiled by HALLDÓR HERMANNSSON.

Cornell University, 1927. Pp. 284. 4 to.

This is a supplement to the Catalogue reviewed in an earlier number of this Journal.¹ Naturally, the present publication comprises, in the main, books and pamphlets of recent date. As to the nature of these accessions, the Preface has this to say: "... the Icelandic presses have been very active during this recent period. They have increased in number, and with them the literary output. It does not, however, follow that quality necessarily has kept pace with quantity. Many well-known authors whose works

¹ *MLN.*, 1915, p. 23.

severally filled a column or more in the first Catalogue have now passed away, and consequently often occupy but little space in this; yet others have come forward to take their places, and not a few of the new authors have already acquired some reputation, even outside the limits of their own country. Poetry still flourishes in the land of the old skalds, but it is now closely pressed in the race by novels and short stories, which have become fashionable of late; and even the drama, in a country without professional actors, is well represented. Foreign fiction has been translated at a rapid rate, though metrical versions of foreign verse are comparatively few. Religious writings, at least of the more orthodox kind, do not fill as much space as before, but new cults like spiritualism and theosophy seem to have many devotees, to judge from their publications. Books on music and musical compositions are also relatively numerous.

"Especially noteworthy is the increase in scholarly works. It is clear that research, historical, linguistic, and literary, has been greatly promoted by the establishment of the National University in 1911.² The writing of text-books in the humanities and the sciences for lower as well as higher institutions of learning is steadily advancing, and these are replacing such foreign books as were previously used. Many of these text-books doubtless find a market also among the general public which in Iceland has always been book-loving and eager for information. Further, the declaration of political independence in 1918 has been followed by an increased output of governmental publications."

The very large material is handled with the same expert skill and care, especially in the matter of cross-references, as in the Main Catalogue. And, as there, the reasoned index is a great help in disclosing references to Icelandic matters in publications that would seem a far cry indeed from Iceland.

Very few misprints have been noted—thus, *sub* Feuillet, Octave, p. 65; *sub* Kinck, Hans (alphabetic order) p. 132; *sub* Kock, E. A., p. 135; *sub* Paasche, F. (Cederschiöld), p. 176; *sub* Pipping, Hugo, p. 181; *sub* Solarljóð, p. 204.

No criticism would seem in order concerning what is, or what is not, in a given collection of books. Nevertheless, when, as in the present instance, cataloguer and curator are one and the same person, it may be pertinent to ask why, e. g., the collection (even under the broadest interpretation) should contain such a long list, occupying over five columns, of translations into several European languages of Tegnér's *Frithiof's Saga*, when this noble work really has very little to do with Icelandic literature; whereas several

² Cf. *The Dial*, 1911, p. 246.

important works by scholars like Gudmund Schutte and Andreas Heusler, directly dealing with Old Icelandic matters, are lacking.

Another inequality which was noted concerns the listing of reprints of some articles and reviews, and not of others, seemingly without discrimination. There cannot possibly be any objection to the separate binding and listing of so important an article as e. g. that of Symons' on King Ermenrich's Death, *ZfdPhl.* 38; or, say, his review of the edition of the Kormáks saga by Möbius, *ibid.* 21; or of other articles and reviews by notable scholars—if it were not for the invidious distinction conferred on authors not so kindly treated. Hence it were better, in a following supplement, to omit altogether the mention of articles in journals which may be supposed to be accessible in any library adequately equipped for the study of Germanic languages and literatures.

LEE M. HOLLANDER.

University of Texas.

Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache. Von M. J.

VAN DER MEER. 1. Band: Einleitung und Lautlehre.

Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1927. ciii + 353 pp.

This is perhaps the most comprehensive historical grammar of a Germanic language that has hitherto appeared, despite the modest assertion of the author in the *Vorwort* that the book "bezweckt lediglich die Unterschiede zwischen dem Neuniederländischen und dem Neuhochdeutschen geschichtlich zu begründen, wobei auch besonders das Augenmerk auf diejenigen Wörter gerichtet wurde, bei denen die Zusammenhänge nicht so nahe liegen."

An introduction of about 125 pages traces the dialectic development of the Dutch language in all former and present colonies and in the mother country from the earliest times down to the immediate present. At the end of this long and valuable introduction is appended a well-nigh complete list of 28 pages of references on the subject matter just treated.

The grammatical section, i. e. the *Lautlehre*, pages 1-235, is clearly arranged. The word material is considered under five main headings: 1. *Die Laute der niederländischen Wörter*; 2. *Die Laute d. französischen Wörter*; 3. *Die L. d. hochdeutschen W.*; 4. *Die L. d. englischen W.*; 5. *Die L. d. indischen W.* Under these captions the sounds are taken up in the regular orthodox way: single vowels, diphthongs, consonants.

What makes this book especially valuable to the students of Germanics is that the cognates for each Dutch word in the Old High German, New High German, O. Saxon, O. English and Modern English, and O. Frisian are given. To be sure English

often receives a stepmotherly treatment as compared with German, but that is to be expected from the purpose of the book as quoted above. The section devoted to the sounds of the French loan-words is most complete and at the same time concise. The same might be said of the chapters on German and English loan-words, altho they are by far not so important as the one on the French loan-words. This part of the book, if not the book itself, might well serve as a model for similar works on the German and English languages. Pages 236-300 contain a large number of special references and *Berichtigungen und Nachträge* with comments. A complete list of the Dutch and German words discussed in the text are given in the *Wörterverzeichnis*, pages 301-353.

Grammars of this kind are a necessary prerequisite for such works on the history of the cultural development of a people as Vossler's well known book *Frankreichs Kultur im Spiegel seiner Sprachentwicklung*. The most recent attempts in some quarters to tackle these and similar problems by trying to dispense with the diligent and laborious work of the *Sprachforscher* are doomed to failure. The study of the development of ideas depends upon that of words. Novalis has rightly said, *Die Sprachlehre ist die Dynamik des Geisterreichs*.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

George Washington University.

Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists. By DR. J. POSTMA. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1926. 199 pp.

The object of the author is "to show how contemporary opinion on Tennyson and his works is expressed in parody, and to bring together a representative collection of such parodies." Since the best parodies are already accessible (Hamilton, *Collection of Parodies*, 1884, cites or prints 22 of the 52 given in the Appendix) and since the study yields no unexpected conclusions, the work seems superfluous. Poems dealing with Tennyson's Laureateship, Baronacy, Religious and Theological Poetry, Drama and Jingoism are discussed in turn. No mention is made of James Thomson's "A Real Vision of Sin," "written in disgust at Tennyson's which is very pretty and clever and silly and truthless." These revolting verses possess more literary value than most of the parodies noted, and (written in 1859) qualify Dr. Postma's conclusion that the early parodies were kindly in contrast to those concerned with the poems of about 1880. The statement that Swinburne's "Disgust, A Dramatic Monologue" (parodying "Despair") "has not been reprinted" is incorrect. It appears in Hamilton's *Collection*

and has been reprinted in Mosher's edition of "The Heptalogia," 1898.

A broader treatment of the subject and a wider reading on the author's part might have made the investigation more significant. It is worth noting that Samuel Butler wrote in "The Way of All Flesh": "Tis better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all," and in "Alps and Sanctuaries": "Mr. Tennyson has well said, 'There lives more doubt'—I quote from memory—'in honest faith, believe me than in half the systems of philosophy,' or words to that effect." Mention should be made of the "topical extravaganza" by William Morris described by Mr. Bernard Shaw (*Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, II, 64), in which one of the chief character parts was Tennyson. The bibliography omits more recent estimates of the poet like those of Faguet and of Nicolson. Such a poem as Miss Edna St. Vincent Millay's "To a Poet that Died Young" suggests the changed attitude toward Tennyson of which the present restricted investigation takes no notice.

Finally it might be argued that Mr. G. K. Chesterton's lines

'Self-Reverence, Self-Knowledge, Self-Control
These three alone'—will make a man a prig,

contain more illuminating parody than most of the many which the author has laboriously transcribed.

L. WARDLAW MILES.

The Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION

Un poète bilingue: Adolphe Dumas (1806-1861). Ses relations avec les Romantiques et avec les Félibres. Par FRÉDÉRIC MISTRAL (neveu). Paris: Presses Françaises et "les Belles-Lettres," 1927. 230 p.—Il y a toujours quelque danger à essayer de réhabiliter un auteur secondaire qui a pu être estimé de ses contemporains, mais auquel les générations suivantes n'ont accordé que peu d'intérêt. On risque de donner trop d'importance à ses propres "découvertes" et de porter des jugements littéraires contestables. L'ouvrage de M. Mistral n'échappe pas tout à fait à ces critiques. L'auteur cite avec une grande complaisance une partie considérable de la correspondance d'Adolphe Dumas. Plusieurs de ses appréciations nous semblent sujettes à caution, par exemple:

Il manque à Dumas de ne pas s'être égaré dans les sentiers de Font-Segugne et de ne pas avoir recueilli des lèvres du divin Mistral les leçons d'ordre et d'harmonie qui font que la Renaissance félibréenne dépasse en grandeur et en portée tout le XIX^{me} siècle français.

Cette biographie critique, établie sur des documents sérieux et

présentée avec clarté, est néanmoins agréable à lire et utile. Il est intéressant de suivre la carrière de ce "raté" du Romantisme, qui put se faire connaître des milieux littéraires, dont l'œuvre poétique et dramatique ne manque pas de délicatesse et contient d'admirables morceaux, mais qui n'eut pas assez de force pour s'imposer au grand public. On connaît surtout de lui le vers célèbre de sa pièce, *Le Camp des Croisés* (repr. en 1838) :

Et sortir d'ici bas, comme un vieillard en sort

qui dans la bouche d'un étudiant devint :

comme un vieil hareng saur.

Dans sa vie comme dans son œuvre telles que les présente M. Mistral se retrouve la marque du bouillonnement intellectuel et sentimental qui fut la caractéristique de l'époque romantique. Adolphe Dumas entre dans la catégorie des écrivains de second ordre qui eurent des amitiés célèbres. L'ouvrage de M. nous présente ses relations avec les Romantiques : Chateaubriand, Hugo, Lamartine, Vigny, Sainte-Beuve, Jules Janin ; avec plusieurs de ses contemporains : Nisard, Béranger etc. ; avec les Félibres : Mistral Roumanille, Aubanel. Il sert de trait d'union entre les Romantiques et les Félibres. Sa correspondance contient des renseignements nouveaux et de nombreux jugements intéressants sur les auteurs de sa génération. Dans son ensemble, l'ouvrage est une contribution importante à l'histoire littéraire de la France au dix-neuvième siècle.

LOUIS LANDRÉ.

The Element of Irony in English Literature, An Essay. By F. McD. C. TURNER. Cambridge University Press, 1926. Pp. viii + 109. 5 sh. This all-too-brief study, subtle in discrimination and deft in expression, recalls Meredith's *Essay on Comedy*, of which, indeed, it is a kind of development. Although Mr. Turner touches lightly but surely on the two Samuel Butlers, on Defoe, Arbuthnot, Fielding, Johnson, Gibbon, Jane Austen, Meredith, and Morley's *Gladstone*, his chief concern is with Milton, Swift, and Defoe who made irony "the instrument of prophetic utterance and the major criticisms of man by man." He omits dramatic irony and the irony of fate and confines himself to "direct and simple irony" in prose. He defines "irony in speech" as "a form of destructive criticism that enforces an immediate judgment upon something by placing it without comment in a position to which it should not aspire, but to which we may add, it probably has been aspiring," and insists that, although the writer's motives may be ignoble, "the sting must be dependent on truth for its efficacy." The importance given to Milton is noteworthy and makes one regret that Mr. Turner confines himself to the *Arcopagica* under the misconception that the rest of Milton's prose is

"trivial enough" in subject matter. More essays of this kind—penetrating and unpretentious but not merely appreciative or "popular,"—would be most welcome, particularly from American scholars.

R. D. H.

Etat présent des études rabelaisiennes. Par JEAN PLATTARD. Paris, "les Belles Lettres," 1927. 92 pp. (Etudes françaises, douzième cahier). It is very useful to have a scholar of M. Plattard's knowledge and ability summarize clearly and succinctly the views now held by specialists in regard to a great author. He gives us the history of Rabelais criticism, recounts the life of his author, discusses the peculiarities of each of the five books, R.'s sources, thought, and influence. I miss only a reference to Mr. G. L. Michaud's discovery of Vives as a source of R.'s educational views and a statement in regard to Mr. Clement's recent theory of the composition of R.'s work. These omissions do not, however, seriously diminish the value of this noteworthy contribution to the study of Rabelais.

H. C. L.

Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. By MARY ELLEN CHASE. University of Minnesota Press, 1927. 207 pp. This book is a valuable study of the changes which Thomas Hardy made in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, and *Jude the Obscure* to render them acceptable to the taste of the magazine readers of the eighties. In all three the serial versions were bowdlerized so that no Victorian could take offense. The changes are often meticulous, sometimes far-reaching, and always with an eye to the prudish decencies. And they are sometimes astonishingly drastic as in *Tess* where the magazine version omits the episode of the seduction, an episode which is "the motivating incident of the story." *Jude the Obscure* naturally suffers most.

Miss Chase points out the important issue, "how far are we justified in condemning Hardy's literary ethics?" To answer this question she summarizes in four pages the progress of "realism" in the nineteenth century novel. She then places Hardy "above all preceding or contemporary English realists," and maintains that he "belied his own philosophy of life." The only defense which Miss Chase can present is Hardy's statement that he, like all novelists of his time, was "the slave of stolid circumstance" and that without the approval of the magazines and the circulating libraries he could not have received a hearing. One can believe his statement when one finds a contemporary reviewer referring to the complete version of *Jude* in such terms as "outrageous lubricities," "rancid revelations," and "a bundle of flash stories."

R. P. BOAS.

Mount Holyoke College.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

JUNE, 1928

Number 6

NEW LIGHT ON THE GENESIS OF *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

The date of Browning's first reference, in writing, to the story of *The Ring and the Book*, has generally been regarded as determined by a letter of his to Miss Isa Blagden, cited by Mrs. Orr, in part as follows:

Biarritz, Maison Gastonbide: Sept. 19, '62.

. . . I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo, and then came here from pure inability to go elsewhere—St.-Jean-de-Luz, on which I had reckoned, being still fuller of Spaniards who profit by the new railway. . . . I stay till the end of the month, then go to Paris, and then get my neck back into the old collar again. Pen has managed to get more enjoyment out of his holiday than seemed at first likely. . . . For me, I have got on by having a great read at Euripides—the one book I brought with me, besides attending to my own matters, my new poem that is about to be; and of which the whole is pretty well in my head,—the Roman murder story you know. . . .¹

This letter, as printed by Mrs. Orr, appears to fix the date of Browning's first literary allusion to the story of *The Ring and the Book* as Sept. 19, 1862. It also seems to confirm the accuracy of her account of the poet's holiday trips to France—his stay at Cambo and Biarritz in 1862 and his initial visit to Pornic, Brittany, in 1863.

So far as I have knowledge, the validity of the date prefixed to the Isa Blagden letter, and the correctness of Mrs. Orr's chronology with respect to Browning's residences in France in 1862 and 1863,

¹ Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *Life and Letters of Robert Browning*, Rev. Ed., London, 1908, p. 250.

have never been questioned. On the contrary, all of his biographers cite the Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden as indisputable proof that the poet was occupied with the theme of *The Ring and the Book* in 1862, and that he was in the neighbourhood of the Pyrenees in the summer and early autumn of this year.

Yet, notwithstanding this unanimity of statement, there exists definite circumstantial evidence that Browning was not at Cambo and Biarritz in 1862, and that the letter which Mrs. Orr quotes is misdated by two years.

In the *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, published in 1923 at the Baylor University Press and edited by Professor A. J. Armstrong, there are two letters of the poet written at Ste. Marie près Pornic, on August 18 and September 19 of the year 1862.² It is of particular note that the date of the second Pornic letter, Sept. 19, 1862, and the date of the Biarritz letter as printed by Mrs. Orr, are identical, and that both letters are addressed to Miss Blagden. Obviously, Browning cannot have written to Isa Blagden from Brittany and the Pyrenees on the same day, and, consequently, one of these letters must be misdated. But, while the date of the Biarritz letter, as cited by Mrs. Orr, is unconfirmed by other testimony, the evidence that the poet was at Pornic in 1862 comes from a variety of sources and is of positive character.

The confusion in which Mrs. Orr is involved through her acceptance of the date of the Biarritz letter as Sept. 19, 1862, is shown by the fact that it compels her to regard 1863 as the year of Browning's initial stay at Pornic. She apparently substantiates this by an extract from another letter of the poet's to Isa Blagden, in which he describes his first summer spent in the vicinity of Pornic as follows:

. . . This is a wild little place in Brittany, something like that village where we stayed last year. Close to the sea—a hamlet of a dozen houses, perfectly lonely—one may walk on the edge of the low rocks by the sea for miles.³

Though Mrs. Orr does not print the heading of this letter, she tells us that it was written on August 18, 1863. This fits in with her belief that Browning was at Cambo and Biarritz, and not in

² Pp. 59-67.

³ Mrs. Orr, *ut supra*, p. 256.

Brittany, during the summer of 1862. But a reference to the superscription and full text of this particular letter, as published in the *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, shows that the correct date is 1862 not 1863.⁴ The heading there reads: "Chez M. La Raison, Maire de St. Marie. Pornic, Aug. 18, '62."

If Mrs. Orr's dates were accurate, the "village where we stayed last year" would be "green pleasant little Cambo," an inland hamlet; which would scarcely justify the comparison to Ste. Marie, "a wild little place in Brittany." The allusion is plainly to St. Enogat, near Dinard, another Breton village, where Browning spent a vacation of two months in 1861.

The two long Ste. Marie letters of August 18 and September 19 would, of themselves, be sufficient to establish the fact of the poet's residence at Pornic in 1862. They supplement each other and give a circumstantial and somewhat detailed account of his interests and diversions in Brittany.⁵ From these and a preceding letter from Warwick Crescent, we can definitely trace Browning's itinerary, in France, throughout the months of August and September, 1862. He left London for Paris on August 2, arrived at Pornic before the 18th, remained there till the end of September, and then, after a week in Paris, returned to London. Further evidence of Browning's stay at Pornic in this year is provided by subsequent letters to Miss Blagden. Writing to her from Warwick Crescent, London, on Oct. 18, '62, he speaks of the physical benefit derived from his summer in Brittany:

You suppose I was dull at Ste. Marie. On the contrary I stayed a week longer than the allotted time, and could have done well there for

⁴ Pp. 59-62.

⁵ Abbé J. Dominique, in *Le Poète Browning a Sainte-Marie-De-Pornic*, has preserved several reminiscences of old inhabitants concerning his stay in this Breton village. Since these traditions were collected by the Abbé during a visit to the neighbourhood around the time of the publication of his article in Nov. 1899, they have no bearing on the dates of the poet's residences in Brittany. In placing Browning at Pornic in 1863, 1864, and 1865, it is clear that Abbé Dominique is simply following Mrs. Orr's account. For example, he cites, from Mrs. Orr's *Life*, the letter in which the poet describes his first arrival at Ste. Marie, and accepts the date of 1863 she assigns to it. But the correct date, as the *Letters of Browning to Isa Blagden* prove, is Aug. 18, 1862.

ever: it was in my scheme to read, walk & do nothing but think there; . . . My health is much improved I should tell you, for I was regularly ill when I left town."

Again, in a Ste. Marie letter of August 19, 1863, telling Miss Blagden of his second arrival at Pornic, he writes of having "left on the 9th for Tours, thence, next day to Nantes and this old place, where I find nothing altered."

The testimony of these various "Blagden" letters is conclusive, but a final proof of the poet's residence in Brittany in 1862 may be cited from an independent source. In a letter to the American sculptor, W. W. Story and his family, dated from Ste. Marie, près Pornic, Brittany, Sept. 5th, 1863, Browning writes: "Here are we in the old place, just as we left it last year, and I rather like it better on acquaintance."

The evidence that Browning was at Pornic on Sept. 19, 1862, proves that the Biarritz letter with its allusion to the Roman murder story, as quoted by Mrs. Orr, is wrongly dated. This, however, is a purely negative result. Is it possible to establish with certainty, the true date of the letter in question? I feel convinced that this can be done beyond any reasonable doubt.

There is, in the first place, indisputable evidence to show that Browning paid a visit to Cambo and Biarritz in the year 1864. As a matter of fact this has been recognized by Edward Dowden and W. Hall Griffin in their admirable biographies of the poet. Deriving his information from letters written in 1864 by Browning to Mrs. Story and Francis Palgrave, which contain references to this particular trip, Professor Dowden notes: "In 1864 Browning again 'braved the awful Biarritz' and stayed at Cambo. On this occasion he visited Fontarabia." Professor Griffin also alludes to an 1864 letter from Browning to Tennyson, and records his itinerary in Southern France with a little more detail.

When the second sojourn at Sainte Marie ended, he had a fancy to see what Arcachon was like. Finding it noisy and modern, he and his party pushed on to St. Jean-de-Luz, and thence, there being no accommoda-

⁶ *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, p. 71.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁸ Henry James, *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, II, 138.

⁹ Edward Dowden, *The Life of Robert Browning* (Everyman's Library), p. 230 n.

tion, to Cambo once more. From this village he visited the *pas de Roland*, which, as letters to Story and to Tennyson testify, impressed him greatly.¹⁰

Yet, while fully aware that Browning went to the Basses-Pyrénées in 1864, Dowden and Griffin fall into the error of accepting the date giving by Mrs. Orr for the Biarritz letter of 1862. Consequently they regard the poet's visit to the Basque region of France in 1864 as his second stay at Cambo and Biarritz, the first being in 1862. They, also, in common with other biographers and literary critics, follow Mrs. Orr in her erroneous statement that the first summer spent by Browning at Pornic was in 1863.

As has been shown, the Ste. Marie letters to Isa Blagden in 1862-63 furnish decisive proof that the poet was in Brittany during the months of August and September 1862, and that the date printed by Mrs. Orr for the Biarritz letter, Sept. 19, '62, is untenable. But, apart from the Pornic letters, a careful reading of the accounts given by Browning of his vacation in the south of France in 1864, reveals the fact that he is visiting the Pyrenees for the first time. Here, too, valuable supplementary information is available through the publication of *The Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*. Fortunately the comparison of the letters we now possess does more than disprove the 1862 date of the Biarritz letter. It shows that the latter was written shortly after letters of Browning from Cambo to Mrs. Story in August 1864 and deals with the same trip to the Pyrenees. It enables us to fix the date of the Biarritz letter, with assurance, as September 19, 1864, instead of September 19, 1862.

At this point I cite, in chronological order, extracts from Browning's correspondence, descriptive of his visit to the Pyrenees in 1864, which have a bearing on the date of the Biarritz letter. The first citation is from a letter to Isa Blagden.

Aug. 19, '64.

Cambo près Bayonne,
Basses Pyrénées.

Dearest Isa,

You will wonder to find me so far South: we had a fancy to go to Arcachon, a newish place by Bordeaux, but found it crammed with strangers: we tried St. Jean de Luz and Biaritz to no better purpose,

¹⁰ W. Hall Griffin, *The Life of Robert Browning*, London, 1910, p. 235.

and having to make the best of a mistake, settled ourselves in this pleasant little place for a month, meaning to get two or three weeks of sea-bathing at St. Jean (as charming as Biarritz is ugly.) . . . Pen amuses himself very well, having a knack that way. . . . I shall be able to spin the month out. . . .¹¹

The second extract is from a letter, written at Cambo, addressed to Mrs. Story, the wife of the American sculptor. This is undated. A comparison, however, with the letter just quoted, shows that it also was written in August 1864.

Cambo, *près* Bayonne, Basses Pyrénées.

. . . We had a fancy to try a new place, Arcachon by Bordeaux, and reached it in two day's easy journeying only to find what was a few years ago a beautiful pine-forest turned into a toy-town . . . and the whole full to the edge of strangers . . . we determined to go on to Bayonne, and did so, hoping for rest to the foot-sole at St-Jean-de-Luz. This is really an exquisite little place, with a delicious sea, and great mountains in the background; (but with) every house taken, every *one* of not a few. Last we braved the awful Biarritz, but liked the noise and crowd of it still less than Arcachon. . . . There seemed no course open to us—pushed up at the very end of France as we were—but to lie by in some quiet place till the bathers should begin to leave St-Jean; they never stay long, in France, but come and go in a crowd. So here we are at Cambo, a village in the Pyrénées fifteen or sixteen miles from Bayonne. . . . I went two days ago to see a famous mountain-pass, *le pas de Roland*, so called because that paladin kicked a hole in a rock, which blocked the way, to allow Charlemagne's army to pass. . . . Well, our plan is to stay here three weeks longer, till the 13th, and then spend the rest of our holiday at St-Jean—say three weeks, bathing assiduously to make up for lost time. . . . I hold for my original scheme till forced to strike my flag. Be where we may return to Paris in the first week of October. . . .¹²

The third citation is from a letter of Browning's to Tennyson acknowledging the receipt of a copy of the "Enoch Arden" volume.

19 Warwick Crescent,
Oct. 13th, 1864.

Dear Tennyson,

I have been two months away, and only just find your book now. . . .

¹¹ This letter is printed, in full, in *The Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, pp. 103-105.

¹² This letter is printed, in full, by Henry James in *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, Edinburgh and London, 1903, II, 153-156.

"Boadicea," the new metre, is admirable, a paladin's achievement in its way. I am thinking of Roland's Pass in the Pyrenees, where he hollowed a rock that had hitherto blocked the road, by one kick of his boot. . . . Give my congratulations to Miss Tennyson. I looked a long look three days ago at the Hotel de Douvres, where I met her first, and of you I was thinking particularly at Amiens station next afternoon. . .¹³

A note to Francis Palgrave, written a few days after the letter to Tennyson, contains a brief mention of Browning's visit to the Basque country.

19 Warwick Crescent: Oct. 19, 1864

My dear Palgrave,—Thank you indeed for your letter and the pleasant news of your return. We were not near each other in France—I went southward to the Pyrenees and Biarritz—indeed, I saw Fontarabia and St. Sebastian. . . .¹⁴

Through a comparison of these various sources of information, we may trace Browning's route in the south of France during August and September 1864, with precision. In the opening lines of his letter to Mrs. Story, Browning writes of reaching Arcachon by Bordeaux "in two days easy journeying." After a couple of days there, he and his party go on to Bayonne with the intention of staying at St.-Jean-de-Luz, a seaside resort twelve miles to the south-west of that town. Finding every house taken at St.-Jean, they try Biarritz, five miles west-south-west of Bayonne, but are repelled by the noise, crowd, and high prices. From Biarritz they proceed to Cambo, "a village in the Pyrenees fifteen or sixteen miles from Bayonne." While the date of Browning's sojourn at Cambo is not indicated in his letter to Mrs. Story, this is supplied by his letter to Miss Blagden of Aug. 19, '64, from the same place. The likeness between these two letters is so close, extending even to parallel phrasing, that they were evidently composed at the same time, or within one or two days of each other. The letter to Miss Blagden, like that to Mrs. Story, begins with an account of Browning's journey from Arcachon to Cambo via St.-Jean-de-Luz and Biarritz. While it is impossible to tell the exact date of his arrival at Cambo, these letters, one of which is headed Aug. '19,

¹³ Cited from *Alfred Lord Tennyson, A Memoir by his Son*, New York, 1911, II, 16.

¹⁴ From a letter printed by G. F. Palgrave in *Francis Turner Palgrave*. London, 1899, pp. 94-95.

were undoubtedly written in the early part of his residence there. Both in the Blagden and Story letters there are descriptions which make it plain that the poet was visiting this region for the first time in 1864. With Florence in mind, he writes to Miss Blagden:

It is very saddening to me to feel the Southern influence again: the mountains under which we are, are just like the Tuscan ranges: the verdure and vegetation more flourishing and abundant, and the villages less picturesquely distributed by far: but there are *cucule* on the trees, and much the same blue sky as of old: few vines, but great fields of maize, and plenty of fern and heather. No, it is not anything near Italy after all but dearer for what it is like¹⁵

This is a definite statement that the trip to the Pyrenees was Browning's first visit to the South since he had left Italy in 1861.

In similar vein, describing a region that is new to him, he tells Mrs. Story:

The country is exceedingly beautiful, the mountains just like the Tuscan ranges, with plenty of oak and chestnut trees, and everywhere the greenest of meadows—the great characteristic of the place. The little fresh river that winds in and out of the hills and vales, the Nive, comes from Spain, which is three hours' walk off. This is the Basque country, moreover, the people talk French with difficulty, and charming girl-faces abound.¹⁶

Again, in writing to Mrs. Story, he contrasts his first impression of Cambo in 1864, with his memories of Ste. Marie in the two preceding years, as follows:

... for the last two years in the dear rough old Ste. Marie, stark-naked as she was of all comfort to the British mind, put this smug little village in unpleasant relief. I don't see the sea all day long.¹⁷

In the Biarritz letter, cited by Mrs. Orr, Browning declared, "I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo." This corresponds exactly with the period indicated by the Cambo letters to Miss Blagden and Mrs. Story of August 1864. For instance, when writing to Isa Blagden on the nineteenth, he tells her that he and his party have "settled" themselves "in this pleasant little place for a month," and adds "I shall be able to spin the month

¹⁵ *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, p. 104.

¹⁶ *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, II, 154.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

out." To establish the precise date of the Biarritz letter, it is of particular importance to note Browning's mention of his future movements in the Cambo letters. In coming to Cambo the poet had made a virtue of necessity, not being able to find accommodation at either of the popular French watering places, St.-Jean-de-Luz or Biarritz. As he writes to Mrs. Story: "There seemed no course open to us—pushed up at the very end of France as we were—but to lie by in some quiet place till the bathers should begin to leave St.-Jean." Browning's intention was, therefore, to return to St.-Jean-de-Luz later on in the season. He gives Mrs. Story the following definite information on this point: "Well, our plan is to stay here three weeks longer, till the 13th, and then spend the rest of our holiday at St.-Jean, say three weeks, bathing assiduously to make up for lost time."¹⁸ The parallel reference, in the Blagden letter of Aug. 19, '64, tells of his purpose "to get two or three weeks of sea-bathing at St.-Jean" after the month's stay at Cambo. Browning's plan was, then, to leave Cambo for St.-Jean-de-Luz, on the 13th of September; spend about three weeks of bathing there; and, as we learn from a later allusion in the Story letter, "return to Paris in the first week of October."

One alteration in this plan must be accounted for. If the letter of Sept. 19, cited by Mrs. Orr, should be dated 1864, how is it that we find the poet, not at St.-Jean, but at the neighbouring town of Biarritz? The reason is explained by Browning, himself, in the opening lines of the letter: "... I stayed a month at green pleasant little Cambo, and then came here from inability to go elsewhere—St.-Jean de Luz, on which I had reckoned, being still fuller of Spaniards who profit by the new railway."¹⁹

This Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden, when given its proper date of Sept. 19, 1864, fits in precisely with our knowledge of Browning's intended schedule derived from the Cambo letters of the previous month. It fills in the gap between his departure from Cambo on the 13th of September and his arrival at Paris about the beginning of October. His statement in this letter, "I stay till the end of the month, then go to Paris, and then get my neck back into the old collar again," corresponds with his purpose, as he wrote to Mrs. Story, to return to Paris in the first

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 155.

¹⁹ Mrs. Orr, *Life*, p. 250.

week of October. Browning was back in London by the 13th of October. His letters from Warwick Crescent of the 13th and the 19th to Tennyson and Palgrave, respectively, contain interesting reminiscences of his vacation in the Pyrenees. They also give a little additional information concerning the closing incidents of his holiday in 1864. In his letter of October 13, he tells Tennyson that he "looked a long look three days ago at the Hotel de Douvres" and was "at Amiens station next afternoon." He was, therefore, still in France on the 10th and 11th of the month, having, in all probability, spent several days in Paris.

The correct dating of the Biarritz letter as 1864, not 1862, harmonizes the allusion to the Roman murder story with facts already ascertained regarding the genesis of *The Ring and the Book*. Browning speaks in this letter as if his "new poem that is about to be" were very much in the forefront of his thoughts. The whole of it, he informs Miss Blagden, is pretty well in his head. This points to a time when he seriously addressed himself to the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Though "the Yellow Book" was discovered at Florence in June 1860, there is evidence to prove that it was not until 1864 that Browning threw his energies into the writing of the poem. In his apostrophe to the Yellow Book at the close of *The Ring and the Book* (xii, 227-8) he exclaims:

How will it be, my four-years'-intimate,
When thou and I part company anon?

As these lines were, in all likelihood, written shortly before the publication of the poem in the winter of 1868-9, they carry us back to the latter part of the year 1864 as the time when Browning definitely began the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Other sources of information reveal that it was in the late summer and autumn of 1864 that the plan of *The Ring and the Book* took shape in the poet's mind. From the point of view of the date of the Biarritz letter with its allusion to the Roman murder story, the most noteworthy of these references is an entry in W. M. Rossetti's diary of March 15, 1868, which he made immediately after a visit from Browning. Here, on the authority of his talk with the poet, Rossetti directly connects the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* with the Basses-Pyrénées trip of 1864. He notes:

. . . Browning's forthcoming poem exceeds 20,000 lines: it may probably be out in July, but he would defer it if he finds that more conducive to the satisfactory completion of the work. He began it in October '64. Was staying at Bayonne, and walked out to a mountain-gorge traditionally said to have been cut or kicked out by Roland, and there laid out the full plan of his twelve cantos, accurately carried out in the execution.²⁰

The fidelity of this report is attested by comparing it with similar accounts of Browning's visit to Fontarabia in letters to Tennyson and Mrs. Story in 1864. He tells Tennyson: "I am thinking of Roland's Pass in the Pyrenees, where he hollowed a rock that had hitherto blocked the road, by one kick of his boot."²¹ In like manner he writes to Mrs. Story: "I went two days ago to see a famous mountain-pass, *le pas de Roland*, so called because that paladin kicked a hole in a rock, which blocked the way, to allow Charlemagne's army to pass."²² The passage in the letter to Mrs. Story shows, however, that the visit to *le pas de Roland* was not made from Bayonne in October, as Rossetti recalls it, but from the neighbouring village of Cambo, about the twentieth of August. Browning's recollection that he laid out the full plan of his twelve cantos of *The Ring and the Book* at Fontarabia is, therefore, in perfect accord with his statement to Miss Blagden regarding the Roman murder story, in his Biarritz letter of September 19. Here, writing about a month after his expedition to the mountain-gorge immortalized by Roland, he tells her that the whole of his prospective poem is pretty well in his head.²³ When the poet returned to London, at the close of his trip to the Pyrenees, he was still absorbed in the subject matter of *The Ring and the Book*. In the postscript of a letter to Frederic Leighton, written on Oct. 17, 1864, he asks the painter to furnish him with certain details regarding the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina.²⁴ These, he says, will be of great use to him. This

²⁰ *Rossetti Papers*, p. 302.

²¹ *Tennyson, a Memoir*, II, 16.

²² *William Wetmore Story and His Friends*, II, 154-5.

²³ Professor C. H. Herford has sensed the fact that the laying out of the plan of *The Ring and the Book* at Roland's Pass and Browning's mention of the Roman murder story in the Biarritz letter, are closely related in time. It is not, however, Rossetti's reminiscence, as Professor Herford conjectures, but the Biarritz letter that is misdated.

²⁴ *Mrs. Orr, Life*, p. 273.

church was the scene of Pompilia's marriage and also of the exposure of the bodies of the Comparini. The information supplied by Lord Leighton was subsequently made use of in Book II of *The Ring and the Book*.

The restoration of the correct date of the Biarritz letter, Sept. 19, '64, sets the allusion to the Roman murder story, with exactitude, in its proper context. After Browning's hands were freed by the publication of *Dramatis Personæ* in June 1864, he turned with zest to his new poetic venture. Standing beside the historic pass of Roland, in the latter part of August, his imagination received a fillip and "the full plan" of the twelve cantos of *The Ring and the Book* was actually conceived. With his mind still full of the subject he writes to Miss Blagden from Biarritz on Sept. 19:

For me, I have got on by having a great read at Euripides—the one book I brought with me, besides attending to my own matters, my new poem that is about to be; and of which the whole is pretty well in my head,—the Roman murder story you know.*²⁵

The letter to Frederic Leighton, written on Oct. 17, shows his anxiety to secure information on particular details and his unabated interest in the theme of *The Ring and the Book*.

Were no fresh information available, the correction in the date of the Biarritz letter would widen the gap between the discovery of the Yellow Book and the first known reference of Browning, in writing, to the story of *The Ring and the Book*, by a space of two years. It would extend from 1860 to 1864 instead of from 1860 to 1862. The alteration in the date of the letter does, of course, transfer this particular mention of the Roman murder story from 1862 to 1864 and, up to the present, it has been regarded as the first literary allusion of its kind. There is, however, an earlier, though hitherto unnoticed, reference to the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* of an interesting and important character. With this I shall deal in a subsequent article.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND.

University of Michigan.

*²⁵ Mrs. Orr, *Life*, p. 250.

THE LETTERS OF ABRAHAM COWLEY

One of the minor literary mysteries of the seventeenth century has to do with Abraham Cowley's "Letters to his private Friends," of which, as his literary executor, Sprat, then went on to say, "the greatest Collection" belonged to himself and Martin Clifford.¹ And yet, because of scruples quite incomprehensible to the thoroughly modern mind, in his edition of Cowley the future Bishop of Rochester suppressed these letters, for the following reasons, which form an interesting commentary on the attitude toward letter-writing and letter-printing during the Restoration:

But I know you [Clifford] agree with me, that nothing of this Nature should be publish'd. And herein you have always consented to approve of the modest Judgment of our Country-men above the practice of some of our Neighbours, and chiefly of the *French*. I make no manner of question but the *English* at this time are infinitely improv'd in this way above the skill of former Ages, nay, of all Countries round about us that pretend to greater Eloquence. Yet they have been always judiciously sparing in Printing such composures, while some other Witty Nations have tyr'd all their Presses and Readers with them. The truth is, the Letters that pass between particular Friends, if they are written as they ought to be, can scarce ever be fit to see the light. They should not consist of fulsome Complements, or tedious Politicks, or elaborate Elegancies, or general Fancies. But they should have a Native clearness and shortness, a Domestical plainness, and a peculiar kind of Familiarity; which can only affect the humour of those to whom they were intended. . . . In such Letters the Souls of Men should appear undress'd; And in that negligent habit they may be fit to be seen by one or two in a Chamber, but not to go abroad into the streets.²

Accordingly, although Cowley's young Boswell extolled the letters of his Dr. Johnson in high and dignified terms for their "Native tenderness and Innocent gayety of . . . Mind," the letters disappeared, and have never since been found. Though that darling of the Victorians, Miss Mitford, scolded Sprat severely as a "Goth and a Vandal"; though Coleridge called him a prude; though such widely diversified critics as the *Critical Review*, in 1775, and Rich-

¹ Thomas Sprat, "An Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. Abraham Cowley," in J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1908), II, 137.

² *Ibid.*, p. 137.

ard Aldington, in 1921, lamented the loss; though Grosart in preparing his edition of Cowley searched everywhere diligently³—the letters are still missing, and bid fair to remain so. Several interesting and amusing attempts, however, have been made to supply the deficiency, as in the burlesque "Letter from Mr. Abraham Cowley to the Covent-Garden Society" in 1702,⁴ or in the more ambitious endeavor of *Fraser's Magazine* in 1836 to hoax the public into believing that the letters had actually been found in the possession of "a descendant of Dr. Sprait" and that the three letters which it printed were genuine specimens of Cowley's epistolary powers. But these forgeries would not deceive even a graduate student.⁵

Yet some of Cowley's genuine letters have been preserved—and more than students seem to realize. This ignorance is well illustrated by A. A. Tilley's reference in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* to the "one letter of this sort which has escaped destruction."⁶ Yet a census of all the letters known to the various writers on Cowley in the last century reveals the fact that four, and perhaps six, of his familiar epistles have been put into print, not to mention a hitherto unnoticed familiar element in certain

³ See, respectively, Mary Russell Mitford, *Recollections of a Literary Life* (London, 1852), I, 65; Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria* (Oxford, 1907), I, 44; *Crit. Rev.*, XXXIX (1775), 460; Aldington, "Cowley and the French Epicureans," *New Statesman*, XVIII (1921), 133; and Alexander Grosart, *The Complete Works of Abraham Cowley* (Edinburgh, 1881).

⁴ See Thomas Brown, *Works* (London, 1730), II, 125-126.

⁵ "The Familiar Letters of Cowley . . .," *Fraser's Magazine*, XIII (1836), 395-409; XIV (1836), 234-241. The contents and probable authorship of these letters are discussed by J. M. McBryde, *A Study of Cowley's Davideis* (Johns Hopkins dissertation, reprinted from *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, 454-527), pp. 6-14.

⁶ Tilley, "The Essay and the Beginning of Modern English Prose," *Camb. Hist.* (N. Y., 1912), VIII, 433. By "this sort" Tilley excludes the series of political letters which Cowley wrote while he was in France and which were printed in 1702 as part of Tom Browne's *Miscellanea Aulica*. Grosart reprinted them in 1881. A. B. Gough, in his edition of Cowley's *Essays and Other Prose Writings* (Oxford, 1915), gives none of the letters. His note (p. xxix) refers only to *Miscellanea Aulica* and the same letter that Tilley knew, although he seems to have heard of others surviving (p. 340). William Stebbing, *Some Verdicts of History Reviewed* (London, 1887), pp. 72, 77, refers to most of them.

business or diplomatic correspondence which he conducted for the Royalists in France.

The only generally known letter of Cowley's is the one which somehow escaped from Dr. Sprat's drawer in spite of his precautions, and which Dr. Johnson has pickled for posterity in the rather bitter brine of his *Lives of the Poets*.⁷ This remnant of the correspondence between the two friends, humorously describing Cowley's not very auspicious arrival at Chertsey in April or May of 1665, was, as Johnson says, "accidentally preserved by Peck," but no other critic seems to have investigated the circumstances of the preservation. Peck himself, however, states that the letter was "Communicated by *William Cowper*, Esq; Clerk of the Parliaments," and that it was endorsed, "seemingly by a lady's hand," as "*Mr. Abraham Cowley's Letter to Dr. Sprat*, now Bp. of *Rochester*, written with his own hand."⁸ This William Cowper was the uncle of William Cowper, the poet (himself an admirer of Cowley), and had furnished Peck with several of his antiquarian curiosities.

Next to Sprat, Sir John Evelyn was probably Cowley's most intimate friend at the end of his life. Two specimens of their quaintly formal correspondence remain, and each is both biographically and stylistically interesting. The first, dated May 13, 1667 (two and a half months before Cowley's death), is the poet's fairly well-known reply to Evelyn's request for an ode on the Royal Society—a task which, as it happened, he had already completed for Sprat's forthcoming history of the group.⁹ Another letter, however, is not so well known; in fact, it appears only in Isaac Disraeli's *Calamities and Quarrels of Authors*, first published in 1812. As Disraeli himself said, his "researches could never obtain more than one letter of Cowley's—it is but an elegant trifle—returning thanks to his friend Evelyn for some seeds and plants The original is in Astle's collection."¹⁰ The letter is dated from Barn Elms, the first of Cowley's places of "retirement," March 23, 1663.

⁷ Johnson, "Cowley," *Lives* (Oxford, 1905), I, 16-17.

⁸ *A Collection of Curious Historical Pieces*, pp. 81-82. This is the second part, separately paged, of William Peck's *Memoirs of the Life and Actions of Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1740).

⁹ See Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence* (London, 1879), III, 349-351; or Grosart, I, lxxvii-viii.

¹⁰ Isaac Disraeli, *The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors* (N. Y., 1868),

There is also extant a short note to the Reverend Dr. Richard Busby, who had become the famous and admired "whipping master" of Westminster School just after Cowley's graduation. John Nichols, who found it among Busby's papers, first communicated it to the *Gentleman's Magazine* for October, 1787, and later reprinted it in his *Illustrations*.¹¹ Nichols surmised that the letter had accompanied a present of Cowley's first two Latin poems on plants in 1662, although statements in the letter itself would indicate a slightly later date.

Cowley's letters from Paris, where he was a sort of secretary for Lord Jermyn and Queen Henrietta Maria, to Henry Bennet, later Earl of Arlington, have always been passed over, as being only of a political and diplomatic nature. These fourteen letters, besides the additional one which Grosart unearthed in the British Museum,¹² nevertheless reveal a steadily growing personal element, particularly in the two dated November 18 and December 5, 1650. By this stage of the correspondence Cowley had become so familiar with Bennet that, after giving a detailed account of the latest news from Scotland and England, he could end with such slyly humorous remarks as these: "My Lord gives you many thanks for your Treffles, and Mrs. *Gardner* for your care of her Beauty; the former I had some part in, the latter I am sure I never shall"; or "I have this Afternoon receiv'd yours of the 26th of *November*; your present to Mrs. *Gardiner*, to Mrs. *Gard* [*sic*], and your Questions too upon it make her blush. Your Treffles were excellent good, as I wrote you word before; as for the *Piedmont* Wine we are now such moderate Men, as to content our selves with that of the *Rhine*, in which I hope suddenly to drink your Health."

None of the nineteen authentic letters described so far, however, contradicts Sprat's theory about the privacy of the audience desirable for the ideal personal epistle. And yet there is one positive, yet seemingly unnoticed, proof that either Sprat himself

1, 57-58, n. This letter is called to the attention of modern readers by John Sparrow, in his edition of *The Mistress with Other Select Poems of Abraham Cowley* (London, 1926), p. xi.

¹¹ See *Gent. Mag.*, LVII (1787), 847; Nichols, *Illustrations* (London, 1817-58), IV, 385; or Grosart, I, xxiv.

¹² The fourteen, taken from *Miscellanea Aulica* (1702), as well as the fifteenth, dated January 8, 1648/9, are reprinted in Grosart, II, 344-353.

failed to harmonize his principles with his practice, or else that on this point he was not in agreement with his author, Cowley. For the tenth of Cowley's essays, after being entitled "The Danger of Procrastination," is further headed "*A Letter to Mr. S. L.*" And the essay is a letter, in spite of the fact that Budgell in the 379th *Spectator* has seemingly been the only person to recognize it even indirectly as such. An interchange of letters has obviously been in progress, for in his opening sentence Cowley refers to his correspondent's approval of "my design, of withdrawing my self from all the tumult and business of the world." Moreover, he quotes and refutes his friend's suggestion that it may nevertheless be advisable to postpone the actual retirement until the hoped-for reward for his services to the Royal party shall arrive. The friend's personality evolves still further when Cowley mentions their mutual love for Cicero, as well as their discussions as to whether the obscurity of Persius prevents him from being a good poet, and then finishes with two verse paraphrases of his correspondent's "special good Friend," Martial.

Who "Mr. S. L." was, however, cannot be categorically stated.¹³ His initials fit those of none of Cowley's known friends—with one possible exception. If the phrase had only omitted the "L." no one would hesitate in affirming that Sprat had clearly played the traitor to himself and printed one of his collection of letters. By his own admission, indeed, we know that he had remonstrated with Cowley about the latter's retirement, although seemingly in more positive terms than the letter would indicate.¹⁴ Moreover, the literary preferences alluded to would easily suit what is known of Sprat's disposition, even though an examination of his published works up to the time of Cowley's death fails to reveal any exact links. However, in Sprat's Latin life of Cowley prefixed to the *Poemata Latina* in 1668 occurs the phrase "*vivendi aliquando in otio cum dignitate*" in a description of Cowley's retirement.¹⁵ In the letter, the correspondent had written similarly, in advising Cowley to wait until, "according to the saying of that person

¹³ Gough, p. 361, says, "This person has not been identified."

¹⁴ Sprat, p. 141.

¹⁵ Sprat, "De Vita & Scriptis A. Couleii," *Poemata Latina* (Londini, 1678), n. p.

[Cicero] whom you and I love very much and would believe as soon as another man," he had got such an estate as would afford him "*Cum dignitate otium*." Whether Sprat was quoting the essay or whether he was quoting himself cannot be decided, but with the other evidence the latter alternative seems the more probable.

But how explain the "L."? There is but one remote possibility. Sprat was prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral from 1660 to 1669. Perhaps "Mr. S. L." meant "Mr. Sprat of Lincoln." The suggestion may at least stand until a better is made.

In essay ten, then, we have one of Cowley's personal letters—perhaps addressed to Sprat. Who was responsible for putting it there for publication? Once more the evidence seems to point to Sprat, for, as Tilley has said,¹⁶ Cowley must have written his lines while he was still only contemplating retirement—that is, before 1663, when he is found at Barn Elms. This essay is therefore not only the earliest composed of the whole series of essays, but it also seems to be misplaced in the otherwise well-organized group.¹⁷ What Sprat's motives were in inserting such a letter in his collected edition may be only conjectured. Perhaps he put it in for the same reason as he did another essay, which may also be considered as a letter and which also does not fit snugly into the scheme of the rest of the series; *i. e.*, essay five, "The Garden," which is further labeled "*To J. Evelyn Esquire*," and which was sent to the latter from Chertsey on August 16, 1666, after Evelyn had dedicated the second edition of his *Kalendarium Hortense* to Cowley in that year.¹⁸ Perhaps, therefore, Sprat simply wished to eke out the charming but scanty prose fragments left by his friend, knowing that this friend had planned to add to them himself, until death suddenly cut him off.¹⁹ But may one not think that the future Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Rochester was human enough not to have the resolution to suppress all the public evidence of his extreme intimacy with the famous man whom common consent

¹⁶ Tilley, p. 432.

¹⁷ See my forthcoming article, "Abraham Cowley's Essays," *J. E. G. P.*

¹⁸ See William Upcott, *The Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn* (London, 1825), pp. xvi, 442. The original MS. of Cowley's letter was given to Upcott by "the late Lady Evelyn" (p. 435) and he has reproduced its text.

¹⁹ Cf. Sprat, in Spingarn, II, 138.

named the greatest poet of his day, and that he therefore took care to eternize himself among Cowley's essays under the innocent disguise of "Mr. S. L." ?

ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT.

Northwestern University.

TWO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS BY COLERIDGE IN CONTEMPORARY NEWSPAPERS

I.

While searching Bristol newspapers of 1813-14 for information bearing on Coleridge's lectures of that date, I happened to discover a little controversy between Coleridge and an anonymous writer, "Cosmo," over Coleridge's essays on the fine arts, which were first published¹ in *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal* during August and September, 1814. Cosmo's letters are not worth reprinting, and may be very briefly summarized. His first letter, to the editor of the *Bristol Gazette*, was published September 1, 1814. It was a serious and not discourteous argument against the value of metaphysical discussion of the arts, and against certain of Coleridge's theories. Unfortunately the author permitted himself a few touches of clumsy irony, which irritated Coleridge; and his naïvete and ignorance aroused Coleridge's contempt. The result was a violent answer in the form of a letter to the editor of *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal*, September 10. It cannot be said that Coleridge's letter, which is here reprinted for the first time, is much more deserving of being republished than the letters of Cosmo, except for the fact that it displays one aspect of Coleridge's character—not in this case, entirely admirable.

¹ Republished by Cottle in an appendix to *Early Recollections* (1837); by Thomas Ashe in the Bohn edition of Coleridge's *Miscellanies* (1885), p. 5 ff.; and finally, more accurately, by J. Shawcross, *Biographia Literaria* (1907), II, 219 ff.

All numbered notes in this article are my own; the only note by Coleridge himself is that attached to the first letter, which is marked by an asterisk.

TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

An ambitious Sign-painter * has been disturbed in stomach usque ad nauseam (eheu! quantum valet invida Bilis!) by my having presumed to elucidate a Principle of Painting by reference to the Works of a resident Artist,² whose genius has been accredited by far higher and more public testimonials than mine. He has in consequence discovered an intolerable deformity in my Essay on Beauty, nay, in the very introductory sentences, and presented me unasked with a sort of Caffrarian *Cosmetic* for its removal. Should any of your Readers be desirous to have the like made up for them, the following is the recipe:—*Stercoris anserini q s. adipe anserino bene permissi. Fiat COSMIANUM.* Which last word Ainsworth cites from Martial and explains by "a sort of Pomatum of a rank scent made by one Cosmo."

I return him thanks, but till he has acquired a knowledge enough not to mistake the Acanthus of the Corinthian for the Rams horns of the Ionic Order; logic enough not to confound the genus with the species, and the species with the genus; modesty enough not to talk of books, which he never read, was never able to read, and probably never saw; (but why should I tire you with a detail of ignorancies and misstatements, at least equal in number to that of his sentences?) in short, till this Nauseist of "mere mechanic ingenuity" shall have proved himself capable of writing three periods consecutively without some offence against either Grammar, Logic, History or good Manners; I must content myself by admonishing him, Nil, nisi lignum, oblinire; which may be interpreted, keep to thy own Ladder Friend! (on which Hogarth in his Beer Street has immortalized one of thy Predecessors) and pray Heaven to preserve thee from Envy, Hatred, Uncharitableness and all the vices, that might finally translate thee to a far less honourable one.

Aristotle, Mr. Editor! tells us, *Cytharizando fit Cytharaedus. Si quis huic miserrimo (ipso quod habet extracto) aliud superimposuerit Cerebrum, forsitan Criticando fiet Criticus.* There is no danger of Cosmo's suffering any pain from the preceding sentence, unless the School boy, who furnished his Letter to the Editor of the Gazette with the thousand times quoted quotation from Ovid, should be mischievous enough to construe it for him.

With sincere respect, I remain, dear Sir,

Your obliged,

S. T. COLERIDGE.

* Such I believe him to be, though by the exquisitely ludicrous Personification of Music, worthy of Holofernes! and by the no less exquisite blunder in the reason which he assigns for preferring this omniform "She" of his, to her Sisters, Painting and Poetry, he would fain mislead us into supposing him a *Fidler*. But this I regard as a mere *ruse de [sic] guerre*.

² Allston.

³ Music, which Cosmo personified in the most awkward manner.

Cosmo responded defiantly in the *Gazette*, September 15, that Coleridge's Latin was "fit really for the walls of the Roman *cloaca maxima*." He again indulged in awkward sarcasm over individual phrases in Coleridge's essays and announced that his letters were "*To be continued if necessary*." Coleridge probably was ashamed of such a controversy and became silent, but Cosmo broke into print again in the *Gazette*, September 29, with a final blast against his great antagonist.

II.

Much more interesting than the absurd controversy at Bristol are two letters * from Coleridge and an anonymous 'S. T. C.,' which were published in the *Courier* in 1810. On September 15, 1810, the *Courier* contained a letter to the editor accusing Scott of plagiarism from Home's *Douglas*, Ossian, Pope's *Windsor Forest*, Southey's *Madoc*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and the ballad of Johnnie Armstrong. In each case the writer cited parallel passages, but these need not be reprinted. The important fact was his signature, 'S. T. C.,' perhaps maliciously chosen because of its identity with the signature frequently used by Coleridge, or perhaps the actual initials of the writer.

Fortunately, Southey saw the letter in the *Courier* and showed it to Coleridge, who disclaimed its authorship and declared that he would write to the *Courier* to correct all possibility of misunderstanding. Fearing that this intention might not be realized, Southey wrote himself directly to Scott, explaining what had happened.⁵ Southey's generous letter of friendship brought forth a kind and high-minded response from Scott, assuring Coleridge, through Southey, that his suspicions were entirely cleared away. Lockhart prints this characteristic letter,⁶ and explains the incident, but he evidently did not know that Coleridge was as good as his word and had immediately published his disclaimer in the *Courier*, September 20. The letter has not been republished and is worth preserving because of the epigrammatic conclusion, which is doubly interesting as coming from a writer who was himself to be repeatedly accused of plagiarism.

* I obtained the clue to these letters from a manuscript note by Mr. Ernest Hartley Coleridge.

⁵ Southey's *Life and Correspondence* (1849), III, 291.

⁶ *Life of Scott* (Philadelphia, 1839), II, 261.

WALTER SCOTT

In our Paper of the 15th inst. there appeared an article under the head of "Walter Scott," and with signature of S. T. C. As this is, and has often publicly appeared as the signature of MR. S. T. COLERIDGE, we feel it our duty, at his request, to declare that MR. COLERIDGE is not the author—and would not have known even of the existence of the Paragraph, had it not been pointed out to him soon after the arrival of the COURIER at Keswick. Neither is MR. COLERIDGE able to interpret the phrase 'guilty of imitation'; a sort of *guilt* in which every writer in prose or verse must of necessity be implicated, if we except HOMER, who is himself immaculately original only from the loss of all the writings anterior to the Iliad.

T. M. RAYSOR.

The Johns Hopkins University.

WHAT IS THE *PARLEMENT OF FOULES*?

Mr. Manly's objection to the whole theory that there are historical persons represented by the eagles in the *Parlement of Foules*,¹ and Miss Rickert's presentation of an entirely different set of historical persons from those of the earlier interpretations,² present an opening for a theory which may, in a way, combine the recent additions to knowledge on the subject and discard the disproved.

There are three theories held by those who think that there are historical persons represented by the eagles. All except Miss Rickert have centered upon Anne of Bohemia as the "formel egel". As to the three suitors, the earlier opinion, expressed by Koch,³ was that they represent Guillaume de Bavière, Friedrich of Meissen, and Richard II. The later view, proposed by Emerson,⁴ and upheld by Mr. Samuel Moore,⁵ is that the three suitors were Richard II, Friedrich of Meissen, and Charles VI. The theory proposed by Miss Rickert is that the formel egel is Phillippa, daughter of John of Gaunt, and that the three suitors are Richard II, William of Hainaut, and John of Blois. In preparation for proposing her

¹ *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, I (1913), 278-290.

² *Modern Philology*, XVIII (1920), 1-29.

³ *Englische Studien*, I, 287 ff.

⁴ *Modern Philology*, VIII (1910), 45-62.

⁵ *MLN.*, XXVI (1911), 8-12.

theory, Miss Rickert presented historical evidence which tends to show that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were not suitors for the hand of Anne at the time when Richard II entered the field. Her argument against the Richard-Anne theory is triple: 1. It does not explain the divergence of the poem from the *demande d'amours* type. 2. It does not explain the satire in the poem. 3. It is not supported by historical evidence.

Mr. Manly's argument against the Richard-Anne theory is: 1. Lines 117-118 preclude the dating of the poem in 1381; but if it was written in 1382, after the marriage of Richard and Anne, the fact that the formel egel does not make a choice remains to be explained. 2. The descriptions do not fit the persons in the Richard-Anne theory. He offers as his explanation of the poem that it was written for use in the celebrations of the cult of St. Valentine, and that the poem is a conventional love vision, in which the central situation is a *demande d'amours*.

In defense of the Richard-Anne theory against the attacks of Miss Rickert and Mr. Manly, Miss Reid ⁶ has urged that lines 697-699 are a veiled petition for favor, and that the story of the *Somnium Scipionis* is included in the poem to exhort the young King Richard to perform his public duties faithfully. The explanation that the last few lines of the poem are a veiled petition for favor might fit Miss Rickert's theory as well as the Richard-Anne theory, for the petition would then be addressed to John of Gaunt; but in that case the story of the *Somnium Scipionis* could hardly be considered an exhortation to John of Gaunt to perform his public duties faithfully. Such an exhortation, if it is one, is peculiarly fitting if addressed to a young man; but one could hardly conceive of the poet addressing it to a man somewhat older than himself. The theory that it is an exhortation has at least this much in its favor: it brings the *Somnium Scipionis* into closer unity with the rest of the poem; but to consider it an exhortation necessitates, I believe, that the person represented by the first suitor be a man considerably younger than Chaucer.

Let us consider all the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to the Richard-Anne theory and see what parts of that theory must be discarded as definitely disproved.

⁶ *University Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Lit.*, xviii (1923), 60-70.

Mr. Manly has definitely proved by astronomy that the poem could not have been begun in 1381, for lines 117-118 say that the poem was begun when Venus was north-northwest, and Venus was not in that position in 1381. Disregarding the possibility that the poem might have been begun at an earlier date but completed at a time when Chaucer wished to honor Richard and Anne with a poem, he fixes upon 1382, after the marriage of Richard and Anne, as the earliest date when the poem could have been started after Richard had shown any official interest in Anne. He asks, then, how can the poem be a compliment to a wedded couple when the formel egel refuses to make a choice and asks time to consider. Setting aside for a moment the possibility of the earlier origin, I should like to suggest that Mr. Manly has answered his own question about the poem being complimentary to a married couple even though the poem ends without the formel egel making a choice, by contending that the poem follows the form of the *demande d'amours*. Accepting this as true, does it not follow that the fact that the poem is a *demande d'amours* in form only, that it has lost the balance of that type while keeping to the form, so that the decision which should really be debatable is a foregone conclusion, implies that there is a real person who is to be complimented by the unbalancing of the presumably debatable question? If the two are already married, the apparent indecision at the end of the poem is explained as a convention of the *demande d'amours* type of poem, and is therefore not uncomplimentary to the wedded pair. Within the limits of the type of poem he was writing—a type chosen for its appropriateness for St. Valentine's Day—Chaucer brings the story of the wooing as nearly as possible to the point of acceptance. To tell of the acceptance in the poem would be contrary to the rules of the type; but Chaucer does everything but tell of it: he makes it inevitable, a foregone conclusion in the minds of the hearers.

It seems to me that in classifying it as a *demande d'amours* Mr. Manly has added a strong and needed argument in favor of the poem being allegorical, for it explains the inconclusive ending and allows one to assume that the poem was written either after the engagement or after the wedding. This assumption is necessary to the Richard-Anne theory; for if it were written before the wooing reached a successful conclusion, the poem would certainly not be

complimentary, and it would stand a good chance of becoming an unpleasant reminder of an unsuccessful attempt. Indeed, since Anne had been known to break engagements to wed, it seems to me likely that the cautious Chaucer waited until after the marriage to present his poetic compliment.

Mr. Manly says that lines 548-551, urging the acceptance of the suitor who has used his knighthood longest, are ludicrous when applied to Richard; but Miss Reid has aptly answered that "if Richard was old enough to deal with the Peasants' Rebellion in 1381, he was old enough to be spoken of in the terms which Chaucer uses here".⁷ I believe Mr. Manly has here fallen into the error of applying a twentieth century concept to a fourteenth century person. I do not think Richard would have noticed anything ludicrous in the lines, and that, of course, is the point at issue.

Of the three points raised by Miss Rickert against the Richard-Anne theory the first is that it does not explain the divergence from the *demande d'amours* type. This argument was directed against the theory that the poem was written before the engagement of Richard and Anne, and as such is sound. As soon as we shift ground a little, however, and propose that the poem was presented after the engagement, or even after the marriage, the argument loses its force; for the divergence of the poem from the balance of the *demande d'amours* is explained by the fact that it is a compliment to the person represented by the first suitor, now the winner, and the inconclusive ending (in form only) is necessitated by the type.

Miss Rickert's second point is that the Richard-Anne theory does not explain the satire upon the lower classes, which would have been particularly pleasing to John of Gaunt. Since the king put down the Peasants' Rebellion in 1381, we have reason to suppose that he might be pleased by this satire, as much as John of Gaunt. I believe, however, that if the poem is taken to be part of a celebration of the cult of St. Valentine, the satire may be explained in another way. The court circle, taking part in a celebration which implied an intimate understanding of the cult of courtly love, might well gain some amusement appropriate for the day by the poet's poking fun at the inability of the lower classes to appreciate

⁷ *Modern Philology*, xviii (1920), 29.

the fine points of the cult. Such amusement does not necessarily imply antagonism toward the lower classes, but merely an amused feeling of superiority.

Backing up her third point with historical evidence, Miss Rickert shows that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were not suitors for the hand of Anne at the same time with Richard. She asserts that this proves that the theory is not supported by historical evidence. Again the theory must give a little ground in order to maintain itself. Granted that Friedrich and Charles were out of the running before Richard became interested in Anne. Still, this might be a case of chronological telescoping to gain dramatic effect. If this were the first, it would certainly not be the last time that English poets have laid rude hands on history and twisted it to serve their dramatic purposes. But it is not necessary that the two disappointed suitors be represented by real historical characters at all. Mr. Manly has pointed out a number of examples of "threes" in the *demande d'amours*. The presence of three suitors in the story may be only a convention of the type. To a newly engaged, or (as I think much more likely) newly married, couple, the inclusion of disappointed suitors in the story of the wooing is flattering, complimentary whether they existed in fact or not. The man likes to think that he has won in a contest, that he was the best, rather than the only, man in the field; and the woman likes to feel that there were others who considered her desirable as a wife. Even if it were not true, it would be subtly complimentary to the man to make him feel that he had won a woman who was equally desirable in the eyes of other men. Hence the Richard-Anne theory does not need to be discarded even if both the disappointed suitors are surrendered to the attack of the opposition.

Miss Reid has pointed out that the last lines of the poem may be construed as a bid for favor. Since Chaucer became controller of the petty customs in the port of London on April 20, 1382, and had been and still was at that time controller of the customs and subsidy of wool, woolfells, and hides in London,⁸ it would seem likely that he would wish to compliment the king with his poem; for he was holding an office from the king, and in 1381 he received two royal gifts, one of £22, the other of 10 marks. If, as I am

⁸ Manly: *Some New Light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), p. 34.

attempting to show, the most likely date for the presentation of the *Parlement of Foules* was St. Valentine's Day of 1382, it is not unthinkable that the appointment of April 20, 1382, less than ten weeks afterwards, may have been to some extent the result of the poetic compliment. It may be true that John of Gaunt would be pleased to have the failure of his marriage plans for his daughter glossed over in this complimentary fashion by a poem in which Phillippa refuses the suitors (though I doubt but that a reopening of the subject even for this purpose would only have made Gaunt a greater laughingstock for his enemies, for the various sources from which we glean information about Gaunt's plans imply that the plans were rather generally known), but the fact remains that Chaucer had already received favors from the king, and might well be anxious to retain and strengthen his position by complimenting the royal couple.

Summarizing all the new evidence that has been brought in, and modifying the Richard-Anne theory at every point where the evidence indicates that it needs modification, I suggest the following theory to explain the *Parlement of Foules*:

1. The poem is a conventional love-debate poem of the *demande d'amours* type, written for the celebration of the cult of St. Valentine.
2. It departs from the balance of the *demande d'amours*, throwing the decision to one of the suitors, thus implying that a real person is to be complimented.
3. If presented before the engagement, it would be a weak compliment; if presented after the engagement but before the marriage, it might turn into an unpleasant reminder of humiliation in case Anne should decide to break another engagement to wed; but if presented after the marriage, it would be highly complimentary and perfectly safe. Hence, it was probably composed to be read⁹ at court on St. Valentine's Day, 1382, one month after the marriage of Richard and Anne; and the formel egel and the first suitor represent Anne and Richard.
4. The inconclusive ending is explained by the necessity to stick to the *demande d'amours* form for the Valentine's Day poem.
5. It

⁹ Whether the whole poem was composed at this time, or whether it was begun at an earlier date and completed for the purpose stated here, is a question which does not affect the theory here presented; and it is therefore omitted from this present discussion.

is not necessary that the disappointed suitors in the poem be real people, for their presence in the poem may be explained by its type, and their inclusion is complimentary to the wedded pair, who could fill in the names to suit themselves. But the fact that Friedrich of Meissen and Charles VI were out of the race before Richard entered it does not preclude the possibility of their being represented by the other eagles, a chronological telescoping for dramatic effect being sufficient explanation of the historical difficulty. 6. The satire is not necessarily an indication that the person complimented was antagonistic to the lower classes, but even in that case the poem may still be supposed to apply to Richard. 7. The probability that Chaucer would choose to compliment Richard at this time rather than Gaunt is indicated by the fact that in 1381 Chaucer received gifts from the king totaling more than twice the amount of his annuity from John of Gaunt, the fact that he was the holder of an important office from the king, and the fact that on April 20, 1382, he received another office from the king. 8. The appointment of April 20, 1382, may easily have been the result of the reading of the poem at court less than ten weeks before that date.

THEODORE WAYLAND DOUGLAS.

Indiana University.

EINE UNBEKANNTE KLOPSTOCK-ORIGINALAUSGABE

Den Klopstock-Forschern scheinen nur zwei Ausgaben letzter Hand bekannt zu sein, die sogenannte Grossquart- oder Fürsten-Ausgabe in 7 Bänden, Leipzig 1798-1809, und die Grossoktav-Ausgabe in 12 Bänden, Leipzig 1798-1817.¹ Dazu besitze ich die Bände 3-6, den *Messias* enthaltend, einer kleineren Quart-Ausgabe, deren Vorhandensein niemand beachtet zu haben scheint. Dies kommt vielleicht daher, dass weder Goedeke noch irgend ein anderer Bibliograph die nähere Beschreibung der zwei bisher bekannten Ausgaben gibt, so dass die neue Ausgabe sehr leicht entweder als Quart- oder als Grossoktav-Ausgabe betrachtet werden könnte. Ich

¹ So bei Goedeke, *Grundriss*, 3. Aufl., Bd. iv, 1, S. 177, 53, 54. Nebenbei sei bemerkt, dass die 7 Bände der grossen Ausgabe inhaltlich, Band für Band, mit den Bänden 1-7 der Oktav-Ausgabe übereinstimmen.

bemerke daher, dass die bisher bekannte Ausgabe in grosstem Format eigentlich nicht in Quarto, sondern Folio signiert ist: der dritte Band enthält z. B. 205 Seiten = 52 Bogen; der vierte Band, 181 Seiten = 46 Bogen; der fünfte Band, 281 Seiten = 71 Bogen; der sechste Band, 222 Seiten = 57 Bogen. Die Grösse des beschnittenen Exemplares beträgt 300×225 mm., der Satzspiegel, einschliesslich des Kopftitels, misst 195×147 mm.; die Seite enthält 24 Textzeilen, dazu kommt der Kopftitel mit Angabe des betr. Gesanges und der Verse. Jeder Band enthält ein Titelkupfer: H. F. Fäger del. F. John sc. 1798.

Die äusserliche Einrichtung der neuen Quart-Ausgabe ist der der bekannten Folio-Ausgabe sehr ähnlich: die beiden Drucke gehen bis auf den Schluss des sechsten Bandes seitengleich miteinander, nur ist das Format hier Quart, anstatt Folio. Das beschnittene Exemplar misst 245×165 mm., der Satzspiegel 163×102 mm.; auch hier finden sich 24 Textzeilen auf der Seite, dazu kommt der Kopftitel mit Angabe des betr. Gesanges und der Verse. Das auch hier gebrauchte Velpapier ist nicht so stark wie bei der Folio-Ausgabe, während Titelkupfer in den zwei mir vorliegenden Exemplaren nicht vorhanden sind. Kollation folgt:

Dritter Band. Haupttitel: Klopstocks Werke Dritter Band Der Messias Erster Band Leipzig Bey Georg Joachim Göschen. 1800. Spezialtitel: Der Messias Erster Band Leipzig Bey Georg Joachim Göschen. 1800. Untertitel: Der Messias. Erster Band; 205 Seiten = Bogen 1-26, letzterer zu 3 Bll. Bogenorm: KLOPST. W. III. B. MESS. I. B.; S. 206: Grimma, gedruckt bey Georg Joachim Göschen. Am Schluss der folgenden Bände dieselbe Angabe. Auch sonst haben die Bände 4-6 genau dieselbe Einrichtung: Vierter Band, 3 Titelbll., 181 Seiten = 23 Bogen, letzterer zu 3 Bll.; Fünfter Band, 3 Titelbll., 281 Seiten = 36 Bogen, letzterer ein Einzelblatt; Sechster Band, 3 Titelbll., 224 Seiten = 28 Bogen, dazu ein unbezeichnetes Einzelblatt mit Verbesserungen.

Bis S. 214 des 6. Bandes stimmen die Folio- und die Quart-Ausgabe zeilen- und seitengleich überein: der folgende Prosatext ("Zum Nachschlagen") nimmt in dieser mehr Raum ein als in jener (10 Seiten, anstatt 8), folglich geht die Pagination bis 221, anstatt 222 der Folio-Ausgabe.

Das beschnittene Exemplar der Oktav-Ausgabe hat die Blattgrösse 200×122 mm.; Satzspiegel 150×84 mm., einschliesslich

des Kopftitels; 25 Textzeilen auf der Seite, dazu den Kopftitel; die fünf mir vorliegenden Exemplare sind sämtlich auf Druckpapier.²

Dritter Band: Titelpuffer, Heinrich Schmidt gest: Leipz. 1800; Haupttitel, Spezialtitel, Untertitel, wie die vorhergehende Ausgabe, auch ist das Datum 1800; 320 Seiten = Bogen 1-19 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 20, 21 zu je 8 Seiten; Bogennorm KLOPST. W. III. B. MESS. I. B. Die Bände 4-6, gleichfalls mit dem Datum 1800, haben dieselbe Einrichtung: Vierter Band, Titelpuffer, 3 Titelbll., 272 Seiten = Bogen 1-16 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 17, 18 zu je 8 Seiten; Fünfter Band, Titelpuffer, 3 Titelbll., 352 Seiten = Bogen 1-21 zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 22, 23 zu je 8 Seiten; Sechster Band, Titelpuffer, 3 Titelbll., 262 Seiten, 1 Bl.: Grunna, gedruckt bey Georg Joachim Göschen, = 16 Bogen zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen 17 zu 8 Seiten. Es existieren mehrere Doppeldrucke (vgl. Goedcke, IV, 1, 177, 54); ferner lassen sich, was meines Wissens noch nicht bemerkt worden ist, an mehreren Stellen Kartons erkennen, auf die wir weiter unten zurückkommen werden.

Schliesslich sei noch bemerkt, dass bei sämtlichen Ausgaben nur das erste Titelblatt entfernt zu werden brauchte, um aus dem 3.-6. Bande der Werke den 1.-4. Band des *Messias* zu machen: in einem der beiden mir vorliegenden Exemplare der Quart-Ausgabe ist dies geschehen.

Wichtig ist die Feststellung der Reihenfolge der drei Ausgaben. Die Folio-Ausgabe (F), die allein das Datum 1799 trägt, wird auch sonst als älteste Ausgabe bezeugt. Die Quart-Ausgabe (Q) sowie die Oktav-Ausgabe (O) haben beide das Datum 1800. Da nun Q stets seiten- und zeilengleich mit F übereinstimmt, so muss jene Ausgabe von dieser abgedruckt worden sein: O könnte dann entweder von F oder von Q abstammen. Die unten gegebenen Lesarten sprechen für den ersten Fall, nämlich dass Q and O

² Viscount Goschen, *The Life and Times of Georg Joachim Goschen*, London, 1903, II, 144, gibt an: "As in the case of Wieland, so in this, there were four editions: the great Quarto edition, costing £7 1s; Large Octavo, Velin Papier, £1 9s. 6d.; Schreib Papier, £1 1s. 9d.; Druck Papier, 16s." Diese Preis-Angaben beziehen sich auf die Bände 1-6. Bei Wieland handelte es sich um vier verschiedene Formate und Sätze: möglicherweise könnte "Large Octavo, Velin Papier" sich auf unsere Quart-Ausgabe beziehen, aber dann wäre wohl der Preis bedeutend höher gewesen.

unabhängig von einander auf F zurückgehen. Dann könnte auch O vor, oder gleichzeitig mit Q gedruckt worden sein. Durch die Vergleichung der zu QO benutzten Typen wird nun die Priorität von O sicher gestellt.

Diese Typen sind nämlich von genau derselben Grösse, im allgemeinen auch ganz ähnlich, aber trotzdem nicht identisch. Dies lässt sich am leichtesten an den Lettern K, k beobachten: in O bestehen diese durchweg aus drei geraden Strichen (Type 1), in Q ist dagegen der untere schräge Strich stets gerundet (Type 2). Diesen Unterschied in den Typen der Goschen'schen Offizin habe ich in meiner Abhandlung über "Die Doppeldrucke in ihrer Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken"³ besprochen. Dort wurde gezeigt (S. 22, 40 f.) dass die Type 1 die ältere ist, indem nur diese in den Originaldrucken der in den Jahren 1794-1800 erschienenen Bände 1-32 der Wieland-Ausgabe vorkommt: Type 2 lässt sich zuerst vereinzelt in den Bänden 33, 34 (1800), dann häufiger in Band 35 (1801) nachweisen; anfangend mit Bogen L dieses Bandes kommt fast ausschliesslich nur noch Type 2 vor. Dieser Sachbestand erklärt sich ganz ungezwungen durch die Annahme, dass Goschen gegen Ende des Jahres 1800 genötigt war, neues Material anzuschaffen, nämlich die Type 2, welche zuerst zur Ergänzung und dann zum Ersatz des alten, schadhafft gewordenen diente.

Es ist also völlig sicher, dass die mit der neuen Type 2 gedruckte Klopstock-Ausgabe Q jünger ist als O. Dies wird auch durch die oben erwähnten Kartonblätter von O bestätigt: in einem meiner Exemplare lassen sich nämlich die Seiten 165 f., 237 f., 291 f. des 5. Bandes, sowie 31 f. und 65 f. des 6. Bandes als Kartons erkennen: nur auf einem einzigen dieser neugedruckten Blätter (Bd. 5, S. 291 f.) überwiegt noch die Type 1, auf sämtlichen andern kommt entweder ausschliesslich oder vorwiegend die Type 2 vor. Mutmasslich ist Q also erst im Jahre 1801 erschienen, wie der Wieland-Band 35. Diese Annahme wird noch durch eine weitere Bemerkung gestützt. Wie schon oben angegeben, sind die Ausgaben OQ mit Lettern von derselben Grösse gedruckt. Wenn nun Goschen schon 1800, beim Satz der Ausgabe O, den Plan gefasst hätte, die Ausgabe

³ *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrgg. 1913, Phil.-hist. Cl. Nr. 7.

Q zu veranstalten, so hatte er diese von dem, zwar gelegentlich umgebrochenen, Satze von O abziehen können. Dadurch hätte er ganz bedeutende Ersparnisse an Satzkosten gemacht: da er dies nicht tat, ist anzunehmen dass O schon abgelegt war, als Q geplant wurde.

Die Lesarten der drei Ausgaben bestätigen die Reihenfolge FOQ. Da der Druck mit grosser Sorgfalt überwacht wurde⁴ sind die Abweichungen verhältnismässig selten: man kann stellenweise viele Seiten vergleichen, ohne nur auf ein eingefügtes Komma zu stossen. Am Schlusse der Ausgaben FQ findet sich je ein Blatt mit Verbesserungen: die dort angeführten Stellen sind hier durch den Zusatz *Verb.* gekennzeichnet. Die Sigle O^b bezeichnet einen Doppel-*druck* der Oktav-Ausgabe, *Kart.* ein Kartonblatt.

Dritter Band: Messias II, 408 Getos FO Getös' Q (*Verb.*) II, 112 und Bruder F (*Verb.*) und der Bruder OQ v. 326 eh' F eh OQ v. 634 Auge, FQ Auge O v. 858 zerflös' F zerflöss' OQ III, 42 Beider FQ Beyder O v. 124 zerflös' F zerflöss' OQ v. 139 schlös' F schlöss' OQ v. 468 Wachter, FO Wächter. Q v. 589 Kennst F (*Verb.*) Kennest OQ v. 640 unermüdetem FQ unermüdetem O unermüdetem O^b IV, 132 des Ewigen FO des ewigen Q v. 162 Geist, FO Geist Q v. 276 Reih', FQ Reih' O v. 733 den weinende F (*Verb.*) der weinenden OQ

Vierter Band: Messias VI, 184 deckt' FQO^b deckt O v. 267 Ein FO ein Q v. 309 ohn Eine FO ohn' Eine Q v. 371 Aller FO aller Q v. 600 Hasser! FO Hasser? Q VIII, 559 Himmel; FQ Himmel! O IX, 109 Einmahl F Einmal OQ v. 545 Mitleid' FQ Mitleid O X, 285 vor Allen FQ vor allen O v. 519 gestanden! FQ gestanden: O

Fünfter Band: Messias XI, 756 Sohns, des FQ (*Verb.*) Sohns, und des O XII, 17 Öd' und FQ Öd und O v. 73 zu: FQ zu! O v. 84 Leichnam. FQ Leichnam, O v. 284 Himmel: FQ Himmel! O XIII, 469 Er FQ er O v. 472 nicht; FQ

⁴Hauptsächlich von J. G. Seume. Vgl. Oskar Planer und Camillo Reißmann, *Johann Gottfried Seume*, S. 199-208: wo nachträglich ein Druckfehler entdeckt wurde, musste das betreffende Blatt neugedruckt werden: vgl. das in Anm. 2 zitierte Werk von Goschen, Bd. II, S. 142: "Ultimately the publisher's vanity prevailed over economy, and induced him to reprint on a large scale."

nicht: O v. 635 gesegnet die FQ (und O *Kart.*) gesegnet sey
 die O v. 712 Triumphe FQ Triumpfe O v. 771 auf, FQ
 auf O v. 777 früheren FO frühen Q (*Verb.*) XIV, 88 Einmal,
 FQ Einmal O v. 940 schweigst FQ (und O *Kart.*) schweigst
 OO^b XV, 109 kein' FQ (*Verb.* Q) kein O v. 489 gröfser,
 und FQ gröfser ihm, und Q (und O *Kart.*)

Sechster Band: Messias XVI, 589 Stürmendes Fluges FQ (und
 O *Kart.*) Stürmenden Fluges O XVII, 515 Ernst, und FO
 Ernst, Q (*Verb.*) v. 551 Maria Grabe FQ (und O *Kart.*)
 Maria O XIX, 122 leben: FQ leben, O v. 478 Ein FQ ein O
 v. 666 Dämmrung FQ Dammrung, O v. 679 sinken!. FQ
 sinken! O v. 876 immer, FQ immer O Die folgenden
 Stellen nicht nach Gesang und Vers, sondern Seite und Zeile
 von O: 195, 5 halleten FQ hallten O 196, 14 sie Wehklag'
 ausrief F die Wehklag' ausrief OQ 229, 20 ach, FQ ach O
 244, 9 setzete FQ setzte O 249, 18 Kreuze FQ Kreuz O 250,
 13 Jacob FQ Jakob O 257, 8 Ausgiefung F Ausgiefsung OQ
 259, 12 Nephthoa FQ Nephthoa O.

Keine einzige der hier angeführten Lesarten widerspricht der
 angenommenen Reihenfolge FOQ: jeder der beiden jüngeren
 Drucke geht unabhängig von dem andern auf F zurück, jeder
 macht neue Fehler, jeder korrigiert gelegentlich einen Fehler seiner
 Vorlage. An einer, oben nicht mit verzeichneten Stelle (XV,
 1292) haben alle drei Ausgaben den Druckfehler *litt'ich*, der allein
 in den Verbesserungen von Q angemerkt wird—ein weiterer Beweis,
 dass dies die jüngste Ausgabe ist. Nur eine einzige Stelle (6. Bd.
 S. 196, 14) deutet auf nähere Verwandtschaft zwischen OQ, indem
 die den beiden gemeinsame Lesart *die Wehklag'* wohl nur als Druck-
 fehler zu erklären ist. Die Peinlichkeit der vom Verleger ange-
 strebten Korrektheit ersieht man aus den Kartonblättern von O,
 die jedesmal einer einzigen Stelle wegen gedruckt wurden: an zwei
 von den betreffenden Stellen handelt es sich nicht einmal um
 tatsächliche Druckfehler—XVI, 940 schweigst O schweigst *Kar-*
ton; XVI, 589 Stürmenden Fluges O Stürmendes Fluges *Karton*.

W. KURRELMEYER.

MRS. BRACEGIRDLE'S ACTING IN CROWNE'S
JUSTICE BUSY

To admirers of the racy notes on actors and actresses of the Restoration made by John Downes in his *Roscius Anglicanus* (London, 1708), it will not be particularly welcome to discover that one of his pleasantest, if most cryptic, passages may be soberly explained from contemporary material. Readers have enjoyed, somewhat uncritically I fear, the following vigorous description of Mrs. Bracegirdle's performance in John Crowne's unprinted play *Justice Busy; or the Gentleman Quack*, acted at Lincoln's Inn Field's Theatres circa 1699:¹

Justice Busy, a Comedy wrote by Mr. Crowne; 'twas well Acted, yet prov'd not a living play: However Mrs. *Bracegirdle*, by a Potent and Magnetick Charm in performing a Song in 't, caus'd the *Stones of the Streets to fly in the Men's Faces*.

The play is lost forever, beyond a doubt, but that the songs from it found their way into the music books was noted by J. O. Halliwell, as follows:

Justice Busy; or, the Gentleman Quack; A Comedy by J. Crowne, acted at Lincoln's Inn Fields about 1699. Not printed, but the songs introduced into it were published separately with the music. Downes's remarks on Mrs. Bracegirdle follow.²

The mere reproduction of the words of one of these songs will serve to gloss Downes's description, which, by the way, he was careful to italicize, and to explode the pretty but after all extremely obscure hyperbole which students of the theatre have considered a quaint tribute to Mrs. Bracegirdle.³

A Song in the Comedy call'd *Justice Buisy, or the Gentleman Quack*; Set by Mr. John Eccles, Sung by Mrs. Bracegirdle; and exactly engrav'd by Tho. Cross.

¹ Cf. Downes *Roscius Anglicanus, or an Historical Review of the Stage from 1660 to 1706*, ed. Joseph Knight, London, 1886, p. 45; *Egerton's Theatrical Remembrancer*, London, 1788, p. 94; *Biographia Dramatica*, London, 1812, Vol. I, Part I, p. 159; Genest: *Some Account of the English Stage*, Bath, 1832, II, 144.

² J. O. Halliwell. *A Dictionary of Old English Plays*, London, 1860, p. 136. See also G. P. Winship: *A Bibliography of the Restoration Dramatist John Crowne*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1922, p. 17.

³ Cf. e.g. Hazelton Spencer: *Shakspeare Improved*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1927, p. 99.

I'll hurry, hurry, hurry, hurry thee,
 hurry, hurry, hurry, hurry thee hence, with such Violence:
 ||: The Lightning from my Chariot-wheels, and my Horses heels,
 and my Horses heels, shall make the Pavement shine. ·||
 If any man stops my furious Race,
 ye Stones in the Street shall fly in his Face:
 The Stones in the Street shall fly, shall fly, shall fly in his Face:
 ||. As Nature does in mine, in mine,
 As Nature does in mine. ·||⁴

The "Potent and Magnetick Charm" of such a woman remains unchallenged, even though a legend be shattered.

Harvard University.

ROBERT GALE NOYES.

NOTES ON MILTON'S APPEARANCE

In his *Secret of John Milton* (Dorpat, 1925), Dr. Heinrich Mutschmann quotes George Vertue, the painter, as to Milton's complexion, pointing out that Vertue obtained his information from Milton's daughter. But he neglects to add that while Milton's daughter described her father's complexion as 'fair . . . a little red in his cheeks,' she also described his hair as 'light brown lank hair' (Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, II, 248).

At first glance, this description of Milton's hair, by one who certainly knew him, might seem irrefutable evidence against Dr.

⁴ The words and music are found in a collection of songs in the British Museum [B. M. k. 7 1. 2 (40)], catalogued under John Eccles: "I'll hurry thee hence, in the comedy *Justice Buisy*," London, 1700, p. 63.

A second song from the play, "A Song in the Comedy call'd Justice Buisy, or the Gentleman Quack; Set by Mr. John Eccles, Sung by Mrs. Bracegirdle" may be printed here for completeness, although it is more accessible than the preceding:

No, no, ev'ry Morning my Beauties renew,
 Where-ever I go, I have Lovers enough;
 I Dress and I Dance, and I Laugh and I Sing,
 Am lovely and lively, and gay as the Spring:
 I Visit, I Game, and I cast away Care,
 Mind Lovers no more, than the Birds of the Air,
 Mind Lovers no more, than the Birds of the Air.

(D'Urfey's *Wit and Mirth*; or, *Pills to Purge Melancholy*, London, 1719, v, 323.)

Mutschmann's theory of albinism. But it is, I think, not quite so conclusive as it appears.

To begin with, Milton's daughter may have been, like Milton himself, weak in the ability to distinguish colors accurately or nicely. She may have been careless in terminology, like many of us. These possibilities are, however, as far as I know, mere guesses.

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that Milton's daughter was describing the appearance of her father as it contrasted with the painting that Vertue showed her, in which the complexion was 'brown,' the hair was 'black,' and the locks were 'curled.' The daughter was interested in contrasting her father's true coloring with this of the painting: to this end, she contrasted 'fair' to 'brown' in regard to complexion, and 'light brown' to 'black' in regard to hair. Now this 'light brown,' used in contrast to 'black,' can hardly have definite color value. It may mean almost any blond hue, varying from a pronounced brown to the lack-lustre yellow of the hair of some albinos. Evidently Milton's daughter meant to say that her father's hair was not 'black,' and was not 'white'; but just what shade or tint she may have meant by 'light brown' is a matter of pure speculation: the phrase may be variously interpreted. Milton's daughter was emphasizing lightness rather than brownness, it would seem; and perhaps she was handling her color name with a view to the 'brown' complexion of the portrait she was criticizing. 'Brown' is, after all, as vague a color name as we have.

The statement of Milton's daughter to Vertue, then, while it tends to cast doubt on the theory of Dr. Mutschmann, is really no valid refutation of the theory supported from many sides, because of its very marked vagueness.

Dr. Mutschmann quotes Keats in his argument on Milton's albinism. Keats, seeing a lock of Milton's hair at Leigh Hunt's, wrote: 'a lock of thy bright hair.' An adjective is used here quite obviously inapplicable to brown or white or black hair. Again, Keats speaks of 'fair-haired Milton's eloquent distress' (*Keen, fitful gusts*).

But it seems to have escaped the notice of Dr. Mutschmann that Keats saw the lock of Milton's hair on 21 January 1818, and saw it then for the first time (for Hunt had just got it); whereas the sonnet containing the reference to 'fair-haired Milton'

appeared in the volume of 1817. Whence did Keats have his notion, then, that Milton was 'fair-haired'? So far, I have been unable to find an answer to this question.

Nevertheless, the very fact that Keats, to whom colors and color names were quite real and specific, used the word 'fair' in describing Milton's hair, is of considerable importance in showing that the notion of Milton as dark-haired was not always held by all admirers of Milton. (However, 'fair,' in Keats, may refer to whiteness, as in *St. Agnes*, 218.)

S. A. NOOK.

The Rice Institute.

A NOTE ON THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF KEATS

Amy Lowell pointed out the fact that Keats's lines beginning "Hither, hither, love" were first printed by John Howard Payne in *The Ladies' Companion* for August, 1837.¹ She failed to mention, however, that Payne also printed, at the same time, three other poems by Keats: "Fame, like a wayward girl, will still be coy"; "As Hermes once took to his feathers light"; and "'Tis the witching time of night" (later entitled "A Prophecy").² "As Hermes once took to his feathers light" was first printed by Leigh Hunt in the *Indicator* for June, 1820.³ The other two poems are usually considered to have appeared first in Lord Houghton's *Life, Letters and Literary Remains of John Keats*, 1848.⁴

When Payne visited Louisville, Kentucky to secure patrons for a proposed *Belles-Lettres Journal of the Two Hemispheres*, George Keats presented him with the manuscript of "Hither, hither, love," and copied out the other poems for him.⁵

CLARENCE GOHDES.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

¹ *John Keats*, Vol. I, p. 113.

² *The Ladies' Companion*, N. Y., Vol. VII, pp. 186-187.

³ Amy Lowell, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 429.

⁴ See, for example, E. De Séincourt, *Poems of John Keats*, revised ed., pp. 536 and 550.

⁵ *The Ladies' Companion*, vol. VII, pp. 186-7.

REVIEWS

Shelley, His Life and Work. By WALTER EDWIN PECK. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1927. 2 vols. xiii, 532, vii, 490 pp.

It is now just over forty years since the late Professor Dowden published his great biography of Shelley. Full and authoritative as it was—or possibly because it was authoritative—it did not altogether satisfy every class of readers. One could not but admire its refined if somewhat ornate style, its cautious if not absolutely impartial judgment. But its mild and dignified apologetic tone was found either too warm or too cold by some Victorian critics, and many Georgians of course have grown quite impatient with it. Some minor facts, besides, and a considerable amount of letters, have been unearthed since 1886, and so many people remain curious about Shelley's life—indeed one sometimes wonders whether they do not outnumber the mere lovers of Shelley's poetry—that everywhere the time was felt to be coming for a dispassionate review of this ever-pending case of "Ariel."

Professor Peck has long been known as the patient and robust gleaner who had undertaken to go over the whole field and gather whatever ears had been overlooked by his predecessors. He has been in a fair position to do the work. His time in Oxford was long enough to familiarise him—a more difficult thing than would seem to the uninitiated—with Shelley's often elusive manuscript idiosyncrasies. And if he has not been fortunate enough to make in England any great discoveries similar to those which enabled Mr. Ingpen to pack his book on *Shelley in England* (1917) with fresh material, he has been allowed by the generosity of American collectors to use at will the many documents which have found their way over the Atlantic in more or less recent years. His harvest is now garnered, in two goodly volumes, whose appearance, both ponderous and luxurious, is full of promise for the student.

The work is undoubtedly the fruit of great labour. It was no easy task to weave into a connected narrative all the minutiae of information which figure prominently among the new things here available, indeed the difficulty was such that one wonders at the writer's courage. Professor Peck would have been undoubtedly more successful if he had not aimed so high, if he had been content with the rôle of a recorder, and presented us with a collection of dry data: they might have been mere references, when the sources are easily accessible, printing in full being reserved (as in the bulky appendices to vol. ii) for those things—Miss Hitchener's letters, the poet's orders to his bankers, some letters of

Godwin, a list of Shelley's cheques,¹ etc.,—which their novelty, though not always their importance, would have made the most interesting items in a repertory of this kind. Though Professor Peck has tried not to exaggerate the value of those additions to our knowledge, it can hardly be denied that the use he makes of them in the body of his work detracts from the artistic economy of the whole production.

For biography is an art, and a very delicate one. It cannot simply and mechanically register the chronological series of events in their perplexing disorder. It must occasionally make logical groups of them, and consequently read the past and the future into the present. And even such groups have to fit into each other. An impression of continuity and growth has to be conveyed. Fresh developments have to be plausibly introduced. In fact a work of this kind must be a clever compromise between the artificial and the natural, a thing in which psychology combines with history proper to make it beautiful.

This nice control of the backward and forward movements of a pleasant and intelligible story, these careful preparations, consolidations and gradations, which turn a "life" into a "biography," are not, it must be admitted, the salient merits of the present work. It is not self-supporting enough, it takes too much for granted, to provide the complete, coherent, harmonious account that would supersede Dowden's. Precisely, no doubt, because he is so full of his subject, Professor Peck forgets to tell the reader something about Eliza Westbrook, and Jane Clairmont, and Marianne Hunt, and Henry Reveley, and "Paolo," as he introduces their names into his chronicle. Of course reference to standard books like Dowden's or Ingpen's is easy, but it is a pity that a new narrative on the scale adopted by Professor Peck should so often make it necessary. Indeed there is at least one case in which I confess I am nonplussed by the author's allusive ways: in his attempted interpretation of the autobiographical passages of *Epipsychidion* (II, 192) he says: "Shelley's affection for Mrs. Boinville, Cornelia Turner, and Mrs. Taylor is next referred to": the index has nothing to tell us about this new "unknown lady"—or "mystery woman," as Professor Peck prefers to call such persons who was Mrs. Taylor?

Such hitches are puzzling and disquieting for the attentive reader. The story of course is fairly complete as it stands, and there is a laudable attempt to present it more objectively than has hitherto been done; the lights and shades are distributed—

¹ Also that rather deplorable ballad on "Parson Richards" (in which by the way, after a look at the Harvard Ms. I am tempted to read "the merry beast ate Moving his tail & his head" instead of "the mere beast ate," as in Professor Peck's transcript).

notably in the Harriet Westbrook episode—with a firm if not sensitive hand; and there is also a wealth of parallels and cross references in the literary interchapters, where a good deal of grain (if also a good deal of chaff) may be gathered by the student. But whether in the literary or biographical portions, the stresses are not always laid where they should be. The titles of the last chapters, e. g., are flippantly incongruous ("Emilia's Marriage" and "Trelawny Arrives"!). And important data for the intelligence of Shelley's life and work are quite frequently passed over in silence. The ominous gap in the diaries for 1815 is not mentioned, nor is the first translation of *Faust*—so significant for the disputed question of Shelley's knowledge of German; nor are the *Fantasmagoriana*, read in Switzerland, with such powerful effect on the whole of Shelley's circle; and it is left for non-American biographies to recall his interest in Brockden Brown's novels.

The strangest thing in this respect is that Professor Peck sometimes omits the results of his own painstaking investigations. Thus I find here no echo of the information he gave us in 1925 (in the *PMLA*.) on the novel of "Vulvius"—it should have been "Vulpvius"—*Rinaldo Rinaldini*, and the use made of it by Shelley in *St. Irvyne*, *Laon and Cythna* and (less probably) *Prince Athanase*. Yet that information was—to me at least—far more convincing than the ascription to Shelley of an anonymous article in *The Indicator* for 1820 on which Professor Peck still insists here (I, ch. i).

One cannot escape the conclusion that the composition of this work is strangely defective. The basis seems to have been laid for a great structure, rich material was prepared, and then apparently the architect was pressed for time and gave up some parts of his original design, and indeed botched up a temporary fabric that surely does not satisfy his own practised sense. The style of a book on Shelley need not, assuredly, adopt the dazzling brilliancy of Thompson's great Essay; but a minimum of care and delicacy should, one would think, in respect to the poet, be preserved. I am afraid that quite a number of Professor Peck's sentences, amusing perhaps and stimulating as they might be in a familiar conversation, will give offence to the readers of his book. P. 51: "The figure of the Wandering Jew . . . set his finger tips itching to be at an apologia for the unhappy and long-chastened Hebrew"—p. 110: "the two young men who were not usual in anything, but unusual in everything"—p. 267: "the lines of attack which Shelley was to follow may be hypothecated from the quotations. . . .", and many other such passages seem as poor in taste as sometimes in grammar. The candid but indulgent critic is in fact obliged to record his impression that some untoward

circumstance has hurried the last stages of the production of these volumes.

There is at first an extraordinary number of faults all of which can hardly be laid at the door of the printer: in vol. I, p. 33, a note 11 illustrates no particular passage in the text—p. 94, "that days which are past" should be "the days"—p. 95, we hear of *Epps*. "II" as if the poem had two parts—not only do we have "mullenium" p. 102 and "strengthening" p. 111 and "Stacy," p. 124 n., but repeatedly "Hurstperpoint" for "Hurstpierpoint"—p. 161, in a quotation which glories in various corrections, we read "mitigate with reason" for "militate with reason"—p. 203, "Coplestone" for "Copleston"—p. 250 n. Shelley is said to have been in London "watching the Prince Regent" on the very day, Jan. 20, 1812 "on which he sent Miss Hitchener" a poem (from Keswick!)—p. 301 "126" pages of notes in Queen Mab should be read for "216"—p. 340, Plutarch is said to have written about "Sarcophagi"—p. 426, we have *αφιλαμπία* for *αφιλαντία*.—The second volume is hardly better: p. 7, "tranquillity of freedom," again in a quotation, should be "of freedom"—p. 12 n., "Veduti" should be "Vedute"—p. 119, "statutes" should be "statues"—p. 121 and 163, (Italian) read "dei" for "die"—p. 169, the extract from *The Sensitive Plant* is badly punctuated—p. 197 and elsewhere, "Mavrocordatos" should be "Mavrocordato"—p. 212, the passage in Keats's letter, "I have very much too much heart to prophecy" should be "I have at heart"—p. 252, the new and better text for *The serpent is shut out of Paradise* proposes "mind's prison" instead of the usual and obviously correct "poison." Even the Appendices, where the "new documents" should have been particularly unimpeachable on this score, offer many dubious and many manifestly wrong texts; p. 385, "5, Abbey Church Yard" is an address that surely goes with the next item—p. 407, read "Lorenzo" for "Lorenza."

Many other, and often more important corrections are needed: vol. I, p. 58 still prints in the body of the letter of April 1, 1810, the passage "But why Harriet more than any one else—a faint essay, I see, in return for my enquiry for Caroline" which I think an examination of the Oxford MS. shows to have been intended as a mere Postscript, and is thus less disturbing to the context—p. 76, the passages on Shelley's knowledge of the Greek writers in Hogg, if carefully read, hardly support the idea that the poet at Oxford was so familiar with Plutarch, Plato and Euripides—p. 87, the corrections in Hogg's letters which I published in 1910 were not, as I was careful to observe, from the "holographs" but from notes apparently taken from the originals and inserted in a copy of Lady Shelley's privately printed book, *Shelley and Mary*, then preserved at Boscombe; in fact the whole problem of the

exact text of Shelley's letters to Hogg is still unsolved—p. 97 and 102, to imagine that Spinoza was read by Shelley at an early date seems the result of the extraordinary mistake which in the correspondence (as published even in the costly Julian Edition) reads, s. d. Jan. 12, 1811: "I will answer in the words of Spinoza: an infinite number of atoms had been floating from all eternity in space, till at last one of them fortuitously diverged from its track" etc.; any dabbler at the history of philosophy knows that this is Epicurus', not Spinoza's notion, and of course in Shelley's handwriting the two names may have looked very much alike—p. 132 gives a useful list of articles of Shelleyan interest in Hunt's various papers; it corrects Barnette Miller's in some cases, but it leaves out some of the latter's findings, whilst falling into errors which had not been committed previously: *Marianne's Dream* and *The Sunset* were not published in the *Literary Pocket-Book* for 1823, but in 1819 and partly in 1823 respectively—p. 382, "Noc" should be "Nouaille" and p. 484, the whole geography of the return journey from Geneva is bungled: Morez (not "Moray"), Arbois, Poligny, Dole, Auxonne, Genlis, is the route followed by Shelley.—In the same way vol. II, p. 61, gives as "Pont Beau Vois" a place which Dowden already gave correctly as Pont de Beauvoisin—I, p. 511, the summary of the infants' petition is very misleading in its imperfect grammar "since Shelley left his wife she and the children had been supported partly by Harriet (one concludes this must mean "by herself") and partly by John Westbrook": the partial support of course came from Shelley (cf. the texts in Forman's ed. of Medwin's Life)—p. 527 the fragment (where read *τετράπους* for *τετρα'πους*) is obviously an answer to the letter from Hogg which I published in 1910, and therefore later than April 25, 1817—in vol. II, p. 258 it was not Mary who asked Shelley if he had resolution, but Shelley who asked Mary if she believed he had resolution—p. 409 surely Trelawny did not write, speaking of Hunt's poetry, that it was "venisomly monotonous" but possibly "werisomly"—spelling was never one of his strong points—and the unintelligible "no power thought . . . then" is no doubt "no sooner . . . than"—p. 435, it was not Mary but Lady Shelley who gave manuscripts to Dr. Garnett, and the sale of his library took place in 1906 not in 1900.

I apologise for giving such a long excerpt from a very much longer list of errata. Every one knows that "la critique est aisée, et l'art est difficile"—especially in the Shelleyan field, where there is such a bewildering variety and intricacy in the sources of information. One merit, let us repeat in conclusion, the work undoubtedly has: its biographical material is presented with a sort of plain common sense that is likely to satisfy the average reader more than many sentimental sophistications have done. But I am afraid

on the whole it is far, both artistically and scientifically, from being what was desired, and indeed expected from the writer; and pending another edition, it will be one of those books—already too numerous—to which critics have to refer, though at the cost of frequent irritation, and at the risk of many an error.

A. KOSZUL.

Université de Strasbourg.

Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage. By HENRY ADELBERT WHITE. Yale Studies in English, LXXVI, Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. 259. \$2.50.

The Life and Works of Edward Moore. By JOHN HOMER CASKEY. Yale Studies in English, LXXV, 1927. Pp. 202. \$2.00.

Shakespeare Improved: The Restoration Versions in Quarto and on the Stage. By HAZELTON SPENCER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. xii + 406. \$5.00.

On October 10th, 1832, Drury Lane staged a grand pageant in honor of Sir Walter Scott. This pageant, which was to the romantic novelist what Garrick's *Jubilee* was to Shakespeare, testifies to the position which Scott once occupied, not only in the minds of readers, but in those of playhouse spectators.

Mr. White, apparently, does not mention this commemorative production and his study omits a few other facts of importance bearing on his subject; but on the whole his survey of *Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage* can be heartily praised. This work wanted doing, for, if we cannot hold up the dramatic *Rob Roys* and *Montroses* as literary masterpieces, if the process of "Terryfication" lead often to folly and bathos, we have to remember that Scott's novels were one of the great determining influences both on the English and Continental stages. Indeed, for the English stage the influence is well-nigh incalculable. We dimly realise its force when we note that *The Monastery* and *Guy Mannering*, both made into separate English plays, were utilised by Scribe for his *La Dame Blanche*, and that *La Dame Blanche*, in versions as *The White Lady* or *The White Maid*, recrossed the Channel to take its place alongside the native dramatic renderings of those two novels.

Mr. White's survey, so far as it goes, is accurate and detailed, although he seems to lack knowledge of the background of melodrama and of operatic farce against which to set the Scott plays. A general statement of the type:

Another playhouse engaged some musicians to scrape now and then on their fiddles, so that a legitimate drama could be claimed as a genuine musical play,

reveals a vague misconception of the place of the "burletta" in the nineteenth century theatre and of the regulations governing the minor playhouses. All the minors had their scraping fiddlers, or at least their tinkling pianists, and the music, which may at times have been exaggerated to "heighten the emotional effect" (p. 131) was not there by choice but of necessity. It seems unfortunate, too, that Mr. White did not provide a bibliography of the dramatic versions of the novels. He has given us a very useful list of productions, starring those plays he has read and providing us with a few footnotes which indicate that such and such a play "was published in London in 1820." Such vague references, however, are hardly likely to be of use for future students and Mr. White's list would have been of treble value had he outlined the scope of the printed text. In thus referring to a bibliography, it may not be inopportune to note that several of the unprinted adaptations are still preserved in two great collections—one in the Henry E. Huntington Library of California and the other in London.

In *The Life and Works of Edward Moore*, Mr. J. H. Caskey returns to an earlier period, when sentimentalism was rife and the romantic melodrama of the Scott adaptations was as yet undreamt of. Mr. Caskey's study is detailed and accurate, and, like Mr. White's, fills an undoubted gap in the history of English literature. Moore's *The Gamester* had at one time a world-wide fame, and even today, when manners have changed and when the domestic drama has attained a subtlety impossible of achievement in the eighteenth century, that tragedy can still be read and performed with interest. Here a man of mediocre abilities, writing from his heart, succeeded in producing something which has been almost able to stand the test of time. Mr. Caskey in his study has done well not to over-exaggerate the virtues of his subject; as a consequence his essay possesses a certain balance and distinction. He grants that Moore had not the enthusiasm of genius, yet he succeeds in showing us a man who, capable and sincere, filled by no means an unimportant position in eighteenth century life. With tempered criticism Mr. Caskey sums up his qualities and presents him as he was—a man likely "to inspire sympathy and loyal friendship, especially from his superiors, but not to gather men about him," a man for whom, as for Richardson, social virtues counted more than artistic.

Yale University is doing excellent work in the publication of these studies in minor fields of English literature. In making known the results of detailed research such as is presented here it is indeed serving the interests of a wider scholarship.

Professor Hazelton Spencer is heartily to be congratulated. He

has succeeded, as so few succeed, in blending the popular with the scholarly; it might be better to say that he has written this carefully documented and academically valuable study with so easy a grace that his account of Shakespeare in frills and Caroline frippery may be read with delight even by those who are wholly ignorant of Restoration quartos.

This work, which Professor Spencer has completed, badly wanted doing. Various approaches had been made (from a variety of angles) towards a critical and appreciative examination of the peculiarities of these quartos; but no one had attempted to survey the whole field in all its details, no one had endeavoured to write that "exhaustive" history which in other hands might have been exhausting, in Professor Spencer's is exhilarating. In order to set these adaptations in their true light, the author has found it necessary to bring in an amount of subsidiary matter. The first part of his work (over 100 pages) is devoted to the stage history of the plays, and this section contains what is virtually a history of the Restoration stage itself. Then follows a detailed analysis of the independent texts, with a concluding note which presents some "general observations." In the course of these various portions Professor Spencer succeeds in gathering together practically everything in the period which is even remotely connected with Shakespeare. Concerning some of the documentary evidence which he prints, there are, of course, several opinions; I personally cannot subscribe to the enthusiastic benediction given to Lowe's theory concerning a united company in 1660, particularly when the two documents really supporting it have come down to us only at second hand. This, however, is largely a matter of personal interpretation, and it, along with many other similar problemettes in Restoration stage history, will not definitely be settled unless new documentary evidence becomes available. Professor Spencer's analysis of the quartos, on the other hand, has nearly persuaded me out of my original belief that something more lay behind them than ordinary late printed texts, although he has hurried somewhat rapidly over one main argument against him. The 1673 *Macbeth*, as he himself observes, may "represent the play as it was acted even before the Wars" (p. 156), the supposition that the variants in it come from D'Avenant's text being wholly gratuitous. If that be so, then this 1673 Quarto deserves very careful attention from many points of view. It may contain genuine Shakespearian matter, and it may provide a clue to D'Avenant's strange appropriation of some of the King's Men's plays. Professor Spencer has certainly shown that the majority of the alterations in the later plays were apparently made by D'Avenant himself, but one can never be sure that a particular variation may not go back to an earlier date, and this suspicion is certainly strengthened by an examination of the *Macbeth* of 1673.

Whatever views we may hold on individual points, however, we have here a freshly written and carefully prepared survey, containing all the relevant matter excellently arranged. For this all students of Shakespeare and of the Restoration stage must be truly grateful. And to add charm, Professor Spencer has provided some exceedingly interesting illustrations. One of these in particular we have long wished to see—the triple portrait of Lacy as Scruple, Galliard and Sauny (p. 274). Altogether, a good and a valuable book.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

*University of London,
East London College.*

Modern English Playwrights, a Short History of the English Drama from 1825. By JOHN W. CUNLIFFE. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1927. 260 pp.

In any history, particularly that of the English drama of the past hundred years, the interest lies, not only in a chronological presentation of facts, but in an explanation of influences and currents of ideas. It is in this respect that Mr. Cunliffe's *Modern English Playwrights* is inadequate. As revealed in part by the chapter headings, which are the names of dramatists in chronological order, and by marginal headings, which are in general the names of plays, the work is episodic, not analytical. The material is rich, but the treatment is faulty.

As a result, I look in vain through the book for an organized discussion of several important subjects. The influence of Ibsen, for example, is treated only incidentally in a few scattered references. The significance of the independent theater, with the new intellectualism in the drama, is barely intimated in three pages preceding a discussion of Stanley Houghton. The one-act play, surely a not unimpressive phenomenon in the recent history of the drama, is ignored. T. W. Robertson, to whose courage as a rebel against the insipidity of the romantic play, Pinero paid a cordial tribute in *Trelawney of the Wells*, is given only one page, in which, by the way, Pinero's recognition of Robertson's genius is not mentioned. The closet drama is almost completely disregarded. And no reference whatever is made to the striking parallel between Hauptmann and Galsworthy—a subject which, I may note in passing, is discussed in an interesting dissertation (1917) by Mr. Walter H. R. Trumbauer of the University of Pennsylvania.

This defective organization of facts in Mr. Cunliffe's work apparently reduced the opportunities for analysis and interpretation to such an extent that it is comparatively slight in this respect.

What views the author expresses in his material are usually sound, with one exception, namely, his explanation of the artificial rhetoric distinctive of the earlier drama of the past century. It cannot be true that the bombast of these plays is due to the tradition of the platform stage of Elizabeth's day. In the first place, the platform stage had long since gone out of existence, and, in the second place, a type of realistic play, without flatulent oratory, had intervened throughout the latter part of the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries. It was not a telescopic remembrance of the Elizabethan stage, but romanticism and sentimentalism that stimulated the sham dialogue of such playwrights as Sheridan Knowles and Bulwer Lytton.

I should raise my voice also against the subtitle of Mr. Cunliffe's book. It should read "History of the English Drama from 1864," not 1825. Aside from an introductory chapter of twenty pages—headed *Introductory* and dealing in generalities—there is nothing about English drama before Robertson's *David Garrick*, 1864, which is the first of the plays listed at the ends of chapters.

As for the catalogue of "Books of General Reference" offered at the end of Mr. Cunliffe's work, I observe that they are, for the most part, only of a general nature; that is, practically all of them are histories of the drama, just as ecumenical in content as Mr. Cunliffe's work. Some books of a more precise character—such an important contribution, for example, as Miss Miriam A. Franc's *Ibsen in England*—should have been included.

In brief, as an acute exposition of the last hundred years' history of the British stage, *Modern English Playwrights* is unsuitable. The facts are abundant enough, but their organization is too ingenuous and their interpretation somewhat thin. As a story, the book is accurate; as a study it is anaemic.

JOHN EARLE UHLER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World. By HAMILTON JEWETT SMITH. (Yale Studies in English, LXXI), New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926. Pp. 175.

New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. Edited by R. S. CRANE. The University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. xlii + 147. \$3.00.

A good study of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* has long been needed. Mr. Smith's attempt is bound to be useful, since no detailed investigation has heretofore been made of the exact history of its publication, of its relation to the pseudo-letter type, or of its sources. One is grateful for the industry which has compiled

the bibliographical information here supplied, and for the widening of our knowledge of Goldsmith's sources which Mr. Smith indubitably effects. The book as a whole, however, is unsatisfactory, attempting too much, and failing to achieve definitive results in what it attempts. Amateurishness of method appears in the failure to verify definite clues given by Goldsmith himself. For instance, the whole section which examines Goldsmith's indebtedness to DuHalde's *History of China* is invalidated by the use of the wrong translation of that book—R. Brooke's translation, published by J. Watts, 4 vols. octavo—although Goldsmith states in three separate footnotes that he is using the folio edition (Guthrie and Green's translation for Edward Cave, 2 vols., folio), and gives volume and page for his text. As a result, the three important verbatim quotations go unnoticed, and the accuracy of all his positive conclusions becomes open to question. Contrarily, Mr. Smith takes Goldsmith too completely at his word, when he labels the essay on Taste in *The Bee* as a translation of Voltaire's article, "Gout," in the *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. The latter part of Goldsmith's essay is drawn from the preceding article on "Esprit." Another illustration of carelessness is seen in Mr. Smith's inexplicable failure to recognize Goldsmith's "Letter from a Common Councilman," which he found reprinted from the *Public Ledger* in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and took to be an attempt to parody Goldsmith's style. The book is further marred by numerous textual and typographical errors. It is regrettable that a book with such large possibilities of usefulness should so lay itself open to censure.

Professor Crane's book adds definitely to the Goldsmith canon eighteen hitherto unidentified essays. For such a service, every student of literature will be grateful.

In the useful introduction, Professor Crane gives first a history of the successive desultory attempts at collecting the unacknowledged periodical writing of Goldsmith, then a justification for his own attempt in the same field, with a careful definition of the means by which he has decided on the authenticity of the essays he here presents, and third an overly deprecatory appraisal of the literary value of his discoveries. The most interesting portion is naturally the description of his method. Here he emphatically rejects the intuitive test of style, as unscholarly and discredited, and states his belief in the eventual emergence of tests which will be scientifically demonstrable. Lacking these, he was obliged to use two less exact tests,—Goldsmith's established connection with the periodicals from which the essays were culled, and his well-known peculiar habit of echoing himself, his ideas as well as his phrases.

In the appendix the editor gives a description of various essays in which some evidence of Goldsmith's authorship may be found, but for which the proofs are not conclusive enough to be final. The

uncertainty expressed about the group of Lives of the Fathers from the *Christian Magazine* can perhaps be dissipated by reference to Newbery's separate publication of the Lives, credited to Goldsmith at the time of their publication, a copy of which is now in the possession of Mr. R. W. Seitz of Yale University.

Professor Crane has combined effectively a wide knowledge of Goldsmith's writings with a convincing method, which he has applied with a moderation and precision which cannot be too highly praised. The reader lays down the book with only one question. Is it possible that the editor places as little faith as he would have us believe in the power of an adequately equipped critic to detect the characteristic note of an author, where that note is roundly and clearly sounded? To this unregenerate reviewer, all of Professor Crane's careful argument became almost supererogatory for those essays in which appear such passages as, let us say, this remark about the current magazines, in Essay XVII: "The smallness of the type, however, shut out two classes of readers to whom they might have been otherwise very serviceable, children learning to read, and old women who read with spectacles." Conversely, if the style of any essay had seemed entirely uncharacteristic of the known manner of Goldsmith, would the essay not have to be rejected, in spite of an array of parallel resemblances? No such essay, however, appears in the collection.

K. C. BALDERSTON.

Wellesley College.

The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith. By KATHERINE C. BALDERSTON. Cambridge University Press, 1926. 61 pp.

The Bishop of Dromore never became fully reconciled to Thomas Percy, the man of letters. Episcopal vocation and literary avocations often found themselves at odds. The bishop continued to depreciate Mr. Percy's *Reliques* and gave only furtive countenance to association with writers of comedies. In his early years Percy was a connoisseur of the curious and the elegant; in his later years he almost permitted to slip from his fingers one of the most curious and elegant of the human phenomena of the eighteenth century. Yet he saved the Folio Manuscript from the fire; and he rescued much of what remains of the personality of Goldsmith. A reading of such an early memoir as that of Glover, reprinted as late as 1813 by a Philadelphia editor as the "best" life of Goldsmith, invites indulgent judgment on Percy's lifting his hand from the clerical plow long enough to do his part in preparing the mundane writer's biography.

Miss Balderston's book is devoted to tracing the devious history of the *Memoir* of Goldsmith inserted in the *Miscellaneous Works* of 1801, to determining what share Percy had in the composition and editing of the *Memoir*, and to discovering in detail the sources of Percy's information. We find here the memorandum—now printed in full for the first time—dictated by Goldsmith to Percy in 1773, briefly rehearsing the principal events in the poet's life. There follows a closely knit sketch of Percy's later connection with the undertaking and of his final severance from it before the day of publication; this account rests upon the generally known data and upon a considerable body of hitherto unpublished documents and of circumstances not before linked into the chain of evidence. The book concludes with a minute annotation of the successive items in the *Memoir*, indicating the probable origin of the separate memorabilia.

In certain cases Miss Balderston has not found it possible to run the quarry to earth. Too often, where documentation is imperatively wanted, *Cetera desunt*. Such vacancies in the record, indeed the entire array of both negative and positive findings in her *History* stresses the need of a fresh treatment of Goldsmith's life. Miss Balderston's subsequently published *Census of the Manuscripts of Oliver Goldsmith* (1926) lends further persuasion. Goldsmith's surviving papers form a slender sheaf. The Percy manuscripts of the British Museum, together with those in the possession of Miss Meade and others, are much more numerous and have not yet been systematically utilised. A new life of Percy may well be prerequisite to a comprehensive biography of Goldsmith. Biographers, in either case, will turn to the *History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith*.

S. B. HUSTVEDT.

University of California at Los Angeles.

Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. ÉMILE PONS. Oxford University Press, American Branch. New York, 1925. Pp. 160. \$1.20.

Mr. Pons begins his interesting and suggestive study by defining the term "Anglo-Saxon." Obviously, if we are to know what he is writing about, we must first of all be told what he means by *la poésie anglo-saxonne*. His compatriot, Mr. Paul Descamps, uses *anglo-saxon* in the sense "modern English."¹ Mr. Pons, however,

¹ *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, I, 479 ff.; II, 524 ff. Similarly the German writer L. Feuchtwanger, to whom *Anglo-Saxon literature* means "modern English and American literature." See the *Literary Digest*, Jan. 7, 1928, p. 25.

uses it in the sense "Old English." He apologizes for this usage (which, as he says, is *un peu démodé dans ce sens*), but pleads that the term "Old English" is *d'un manquement malaisé en français*. If he is right here, the French must have a hard time indeed, what with such terms as Old French, Old Irish, Old Norse, Old Saxon and Old High German in addition to the troublesome Old English; perhaps the linguistic difficulty explains their comparative neglect of the mediæval field. But however that may be, it is certainly unfortunate that Mr. Pons has included in the title of his book a term so vague that it may refer to any period of English literature from the good year 600 to the present day. We must not infer, however, from Mr. Pons's terminology that he follows Mr. Legouis in excluding OE literature from English. On the contrary, he recognizes and even stresses the solidarity of mediæval English literary tradition. Thus, of the *Garvain* poet he says (pp. 153 f.), *c'est lui . . . qui nous apparaît comme le dernier et le plus pur représentant, en cette seconde partie du moyen âge, du lyrisme anglo-saxon de la nature*.

Mr. Pons's work falls into six chapters. Of these, the first three deal with the hackneyed problem of distinguishing the Christian from the heathen elements in OE poetry. In Chapter IV, the author dissects the OE *sentiment de la nature* into three chief elements: *sentiment chrétien de la mort, réalisme, esprit mythique*. Chapter V is devoted to other elements of less weight. Chapter VI sums up the whole: *le sentiment de la nature . . . c'est lui qui, en dépit des influences étrangères, reparait, sous sa forme originale, dans le plus haut lyrisme anglais de tous les temps* (p. 156).

The analysis which the author gives us is interesting and suggestive, as I have said, but the thesis quoted from Chapter VI remains unproved. And the difficulty lies, I think, in the nature of the case. Mr. Pons has looked at OE literature from a certain point of view, and has drawn his conclusions. But it is possible to look at the same material from other points of view, and to draw other conclusions, equally valid. Mr. Pons's realism may be another's romanticism, and yet another's conventionality. In particular, I am skeptical of some of the *survivances païennes* set forth in Chapter III. Thus, the superstitions reflected in OE literature are hardly fragments of an earlier mythical edifice, but represent rather a sturdy world of popular belief as little touched by the higher heathen cults as by the Christianity which overthrew those cults.

The author makes some unfortunate mistakes of an elementary kind. Thus, we are told (p. 8) of *le discours de Heremod sur la destinée de l'homme* and (p. 23) of the *dragon Fenrir*. I must object, moreover, to the whole passage in which Mr. Pons discusses the date of *Beowulf*. He says (p. 6) that *Beowulf* is nowadays

looked upon as having been *composé tardivement* (*peut-être à la fin du IX^e siècle?*) and cites not only Schucking but also Klaeber as his authorities. But Klaeber (*Beowulf*, p. cxvi) in fact puts the composition of the poem in the first half of the eighth century, and this is still the usual dating, in spite of Schucking's heterodox views. Thus A. S. Cook says,² "the prevailing opinion places the composition of *Beowulf* not far from 700."

KEMP MALONE.

Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung. Von EMIL ERMATINGER. (Gewalten und Gestalten Bd. 4) Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1926.

Dies Buch ist schon rein äußerlich charakterisiert durch die bewundernswürdige Leistung einer Konzentration, mit der es eine zweihundertjährige Entwicklung auf 179 Seiten zusammendrängt ohne Einbuße an Klarheit und Sinnfälligkeit. Es entwickelt die These, daß vom sechzehnten Jahrhundert an zwei Stränge der Aufklärung, ein geistlich-religiöser und ein weltlich-wissenschaftlicher, zuerst nebeneinander herlaufen, und zwar getrennt, der erste in Deutschland und der andere in außerdeutschen Ländern, und dann sich im achtzehnten Jahrhundert in Deutschland durchdringen. Verselbständigung des Denkens, Lockerung und Flüssigmachung des orthodoxen Geistesgrundes, Erschütterung der Dogmatik ist nach Ermatinger eben auch Aufklärung, nämlich eine metaphysisch-religiöse, wie sie sich in der Barockspannung dokumentiert: dem 'Sich-Emporringen der Weltlust und Diesseits-tüchtigkeit gegen den schweren Druck des Weltleidens und der Jenseitsbereitschaft, und umgekehrt, der gewaltsamen Hemmung und Weltbejahung durch die Diesseitsverneinung in einer letzten, höchsten Steigerung' (p. 24).

Descartes' *Traité des passions de l'âme* (1649) mit seinem Zwiespalt von Leidenschaft und Vernunft und die stoische Beherrschung und Klärung der Leidenschaften leiten die Zersetzung dieser Barockepoche ein mit dem Anfang psychologischen Interesses in Lohenstein und Hofmannswaldau.

Das Rokoko dagegen ist charakterisiert durch das menschliche Ordnungsvermögen der Ratio. Es ist wohl kein Zufall, daß ein Schweizer diesem ordnenden Prinzip gerecht werden und das Verdienst Calvins nach Gebühr würdigen konnte, während man in Deutschland von jeher dem Rationalismus in einer gewissen Mißtrauens- und Abwehrstellung gegenüberstand. Ermatinger sieht, daß der Irrationalismus des Barock seelenvertiefend, aber auch seelenzersetzend wirkt, und betont die sammelnde, auf-

² *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences*, XXVII, 395.

bauende und zielsetzende Kraft der Vernunfttrichtung, die von Calvin über Spinoza, Shaftesbury bis zum psychologischen Materialismus verläuft, zu Naturrecht und Naturreligion führt und zur Entwicklungsidee, in der Geschichte als ein Aufstieg zu größerer Reinheit und Einheit mit Gott erscheint (Johannes Koch in Leiden). Aber auch der Pietismus verlegt den Sinn des Christentums in psychologisches und sittliches Gebiet, 'die Mystik und der Rationalismus, so wesensverschieden sie scheinen, stehen im Grund einander näher, als man meint: was sie eint, ist bei beiden die Mißachtung der Welt der natürlichen Erscheinungen und die innere Dialektik des reinen Geistes' (p. 99).

Mit Leibniz ist dann die Dynamik der Vernunft und die Individuation alles Lebens erreicht; der Entwicklungsgedanke als Wesensidee der Aufklärung wird lebendig: Streben aus der Dumpfheit bloßer Empfindung in die Klarheit bewußter Erkenntnis der Welt, fortschreitende Erhellung der Welt und Vervollkommenung ihres Zustandes. Christian Wolff bedeutet gedanklich einen Rückschritt durch seine Entwirklichung Leibnizscher Gedanken, die Schweizer dagegen—häufig mißverstanden—erkennen den irrationalen Wesensgrund der Dichtung.

Diese kurze Zusammenfassung des Buches gibt ein sehr unvollkommenes Bild des hier Geleisteten; denn Ermatinger abstrahiert nicht nur, er belebt—es ist das wirklich eine erstaunliche Leistung—individuelle Gestalten, hebt besonders charakteristische Stellen in treffender Wahl aus ihren Schriften und beleuchtet auch vorweisend durch suggestive Wortgebung bereits weite Strecken des noch übrigen Weges: man glaubt oft Prolegomena zu einer Fausterklärung zu lesen. Nicht genannt und dennoch geahnt steht am Ende dieses Weges der Große, dem es gelingt, die geistigen Kraftströme zweier Jahrhunderte auf seine Mühle zu schlagen.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

L'Europe littéraire (1833-34)—*un essai de périodique littéraire.*

Par THOMAS R. PALFREY. Paris, Champion, 1927. Pp. vi + 188.

Dr. Palfrey's dissertation, which is volume xxxii of the *Bibliothèque de la RLC.*, is a careful examination of *l'Europe littéraire*, an ephemeral periodical of which 107 issues appeared from March 1, 1833 to Feb. 6, 1834. Its importance lies in its exceeding rarity at present, for P. has found only one complete collection, that of Spoelberch de Lovenjoul at Chantilly. It has been virtu-

ally inaccessible to students of the period, but P. gives such exact information as to the aims, contents and collaborators of the journal that it is now unnecessary to go to its files for this knowledge. The 8 chapters of the dissertation give a satisfactory account of the brief history of *l'Europe littéraire*, its rivals in the journalistic field, its editors and principal collaborators, its foreign relations, its contributions to literary and art criticisms, and its place in the Romantic movement, of which it was a militant champion. Hugo, Nodier, and Balzac contributed to its pages hitherto unpublished writings; most important among these are chapter I of *Eugène Grandet* and the "Veillée" of the *Médecin de campagne*. Among the foreign contributors were Heine and Immermann; English literature is represented chiefly by two articles on Tennyson; the United States are snubbed with the rather sneering remark that "son ère intellectuelle n'a pas encore sonné." All in all, a rather fragmentary literary baggage of little merit. The main justification for so detailed a study is that the journal did, at the outset, have a "lofty conception of its rôle" as medium for the spread of mutual understanding and good-will in the artistic world of its day.

Perhaps the most valuable section of the work is the *Index analytique de l'Europe littéraire* and three appendices, which occupy considerably more actual space than does the study itself. The *Index* gives a complete table of contents of the periodical; the appendices include much information about the journal, its patrons, and its collaborators, with bio-bibliographical material on these latter. The study has clearly been prepared in a very painstaking manner and is endowed with an air of finality. Attention should be called to what seems an erroneous statement, on the part of the author, to the effect that the editors of *l'Europe littéraire*, contrary to their promise to exclude politics rigorously from their journal, had decided, by the end of 1833, to champion the cause of the Church and the Bourbons. "Victor Hugo et Balzac,"¹ we read, "les deux rédacteurs principaux, partageaient alors (nous sommes en 1833) les idées religieuses de la direction." To speak of Hugo as a Legitimist in 1833, after his *volle-face* between August 14, 1829 and August 7, 1830, is inaccurate.² Hugo's name must be here left out of consideration and the esteem in which he was held by the editors of *l'Europe littéraire* explained on other grounds than his supposed loyalty to the Legitimist party.

AARON SCHAFFER.

University of Texas.

¹ P. 51.

² Vide Edmond Biré: *Victor Hugo après 1830* (Paris, Perrin, 1891, pp. 1 et seq.)

Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval. By ARISTIDE MARIE.
Paris: Champion, 1926.

The critical edition of the works of Gérard de Nerval, the publication of which has recently been undertaken by M. Edouard Champion, has been inaugurated by a methodical bibliography, in which the editions of his numerous writings have been arranged in chronological order. The work of compiling a bibliography of Gérard de Nerval was by no means an easy task. His verses, stories, translations, criticisms, and dramatic fragments are, for the most part, scattered in a great number of periodicals, many of which long ago ceased to be published and have become by now difficult of access. Moreover, Nerval had the habit of publishing his writings under various pseudonyms and, to a certain extent, anonymously so that it is often difficult to determine their authorship with any degree of certainty.

The bibliography under review is preceded by a critical study on the history of the works of Nerval and is interspersed by reproductions of the title-pages of their original editions. The alphabetical list of critical, biographical, and bibliographical books and articles written about Nerval, which is printed at the end of the volume, is, with few exceptions, limited to material written in French.¹ The compiler lays no claim to completeness, but maintains that he took great pains, with the aid of other admirers of Nerval, to unearth as much as he could of all that has so far been written on his literary idol, of whom he is the acknowledged biographer. It is greatly to be regretted, though, that he is unfamiliar with Thieme's *Guide bibliographique*, which would have furnished him an additional dozen items. In addition to those there mentioned may be listed: *Gérard de Nerval*, (*De la Connaissance des livres*, fascicule 5.) 1886; Edmond Jaloux, *Gérard de Nerval, ses amours, sa folie, sa mort*, Paris, Editions d'Art, n. d.; Pierre Audiat, *L' "Aurélia" de Gérard de Nerval*, Paris, Champion, 1925; and two interesting articles, both of which appeared in 1923, the first in the Berlin periodical *Die Literatur* (successor to the *Literarisches Echo*), and the second in the *North-American Review* under the title: "Backwaters of Romanticism."

Of foreign translation, the compiler of the bibliography under review mentions only, as a curiosity perhaps, a Russian version of *Le Prince des sots*, which appeared in 1889. No English or German translations are given. It may be well to refer to an English version of *Les filles du feu* by James Whitall (London,

¹ The pagination given for periodicals is often incorrect.

1924) and especially to an English adaptation of the dramatic fragment of *Nicolas Flamel* by Seumus O'Sullivan, who added the last scene (*The Dublin Magazine*, I, (1923/24), 503-12).

MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

Baker University.

A Grammar of the Dialect of Penrith (Cumberland). Descriptive and Historical, with Specimens and a Glossary. By PERCY H. REANEY. Manchester, London, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. Pp. xv + 215.

The greater part of his material, the author informs us in the Preface, was gathered during two years of residence in Penrith, 1912-1913, though it has been added to and checked during later visits. The author is himself a Northerner, but nevertheless often found it difficult to understand what he heard when listening to Penrith farmers; and it was this that first led him to study the dialect. There have been other earlier studies made of Cumbrian of more isolated places than that dealt with here. Penrith is rather accessible, and the inroads that Standard English has made on local speech are seen here on every page. The author has known how to secure genuine dialectal forms and pronunciation; and he shows wide knowledge of the scientific literature on English dialects, the history of Standard English, and of the closely related languages a knowledge of which is so essential for such a study. I miss information on some points, and I can not always agree with him (there are many things in the difficult and complex vernaculars of Northwestern England that are capable of different explanations); but on the whole the work has been very well done, and the results are a real contribution to English.

Many years ago I visited the not distant village of Keswick, and gathered some material for a certain purpose then in hand. Reading this book, I have been struck with the rapidity of changes that have been going on during the last twenty-five years. Mr. Reaney, however, remarks that 'Even to-day educated Cumbrians are bilingual, and their pride and interest in their native tongue and its literature will preserve it for generations to come.' But Joseph Wright wrote in the Preface to his *English Dialect Grammar* in 1905, that had that work been delayed another twenty years he believed that "it would by then be quite impossible to get together sufficient pure dialectal material to enable one to give a mere outline of the phonology of our dialects as they existed at the close of the XIXth century" (p. vii). Penrith has gone far toward this state of disintegration. One can observe here, as perhaps in few

localities in Northern England, how a dialect that some thirty or forty years ago was a fairly pure local vernacular has become colored in all parts of its grammar, and in its pronunciation, by the influence of Standard Speech. And we can see the process going on: how a historically and regularly developed word-form that was in general use then is now rarely heard, 'only used by old persons' (and children); how 'pure dialect' words are disappearing. And herein lies, perhaps, the chief value of Reaney's study: it gives us a most interesting picture of such a mixed dialect in the making. I say purposely 'a mixed dialect in the making,' for it must not be supposed that what is going on is a rapid change from pure Cumbrian to Standard Speech. When one observes carefully the nature of the changes that are going on, one will, I think, be inclined to agree with the author; it will be many generations before Cumbrians will speak Standard. For, if many words from the latter are coming in, likewise parts of paradigms, there are also other things that are happening. The words of St. Sp. are being taken over, but dialectal influence gives them a different vowel (or consonant) perhaps; a phonologically correct dialect form is by dialectal analogy replaced by an entirely different one. Nothing illustrates better the vitality of the dialects of Cumberland, and even this very mixed example, than such things as these. For example: the adjective *na*: 'near,'¹ comp. *na:r*, superl. *na:rəst*, *nekst*, and *niást* (§ 482). How much is 'traditional,' 'genuine,' 'correct' here? Surely only the comparative *na:r* (i.e. in this part of Cumberland). The Old Anglian *nēh* (OE *nēah*) would have given us [ni:], but this has been replaced by the form [na:] of the comparative. In the superlative the regularly developed form would be [ni:st], as it was a generation ago in the same region of Cumberland, and in adjacent northern Westmoreland (and still is in some places). But this has been modified to [niást], probably by influence of [miást], superlative of [mut/]. However, even [niást] is rare; the commonest form is [na:rəst], another dialectal analogical form. Finally [nekst] is used, and this is clearly St. Eng. *next*.

Again, in the first class of strong verbs: the verb [straik], 'to strike,' pret. [struk], pp. [struk] is in no part of it influenced by St. Eng. *straike*—*str^k*—*str^k*. The infinitive [straik] is correct for this dialect (as Reaney shows, § 185), the other two forms should be [striák, strikn]. These have been replaced by influence of Class II ([bind-bund-bund]). However [raid, rait], and [raiz],² are regular: [riád, riðn, riát, ritn], and [riaz, rizn]; [raid] and [raiz] have preserved both pret. vowel forms: [riád], and [rið];

¹ *a*: = long *a* of *father*.

² *Ride, write, and rise*.

[riáz] and [riz]. But with [draiv], 'to drive' we have a 'mixed' condition again; the forms are [draiv—driáv, drø:v,—drivn, drovn, druvn]. Here is one St. Eng. form: [dr v], 'drove.' But, as we see, this is not pronounced *drov*; or *drouv*, the form [dr v], is better Penrithian, it is the Northern [ø:] instead of the Southern *ou* (*o*).

I do not think that the author has always succeeded in making these things sufficiently clear. He has sometimes offered an equation of sounds or a derivation which has seemed doubtful to me, because it contradicts the regular Penrithian development of the sound in like environment. Thus under OE. *æg*, § 113, the Penrith equivalent is [iá], as [nái], 'nail,' [bríans], 'brams,' unless followed by *r*, or when final, in which case it becomes [ε], as [de:] 'day,' and [fer], 'fair.' But under the examples of [-uá-], there is a note which says: [ε:] is now often heard: [braus, 'brams,' [de:zi], 'daisy.' Are we to infer then that the sound [ε] here is due to the cases with [ε]? To me it seems clear that *brens* and *dezi* are simply borrowings from Standard speech. Further, in § 170, we see that OE. *ā*, when final becomes [jə], as [mā], 'no,' [tjə], 'toe,' [twiə], 'two.' Then a note says: "We still hear in Penrith [ga:] 'to go,' [gə:z] 'goes'" ... "Old people still use the obsolescent form [twa] two." But how are these forms to be understood (in a dialect of southern Cumberland)? Wyld, *A Short History of English* (third ed., 1927, § 225, § 157), has shown that northern ME. *ā* was fronted to *ē* by the XIVth century. The form [twiə] is, of course absolutely regular. But the note seems to be intended to say that old people still preserve the original form *twā* (by the side of the form that came from *twē*). However, in § 13 the author suggests that the sound *a:* (open mixed lax unrounded) which only occurs in five words (that are listed) "is probably due to the influence of the Westmoreland dialect"; and among the words listed are [ga:] and [twa:]. Similarly under OE *ēag*, Anglian *ēh*, § 209, we are told that this has become [ai] in Penrith, and the examples given are [aiz], eyes, and [dai], 'to dye.' Thereupon the obsolescent form [i:], 'eye,' [i:n], 'eyes,' is noted, and it is concluded that the *ai*-forms are "evidently loans from standard English." It must be rather certain that they are; and hence also, that the fact is that OE *ēa*, also in the combinations *ēah* and *ēag*, has become [i:] in Penrith (and that the form [fløi], 'flea' is to be otherwise explained).

I shall also note the following matters:

§ 66. "ME. *a* + *g* < Scand. *a*, *ö* (*ø*) + *gg*." The *ö*, as a special XIIIth century Icelandic development of *ø*, should be omitted.

§ 67. Of the nineteen sources of Penrith [ε] those of numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 14 are from *a:* apparently regularly if the group dental + another consonant immediately follows. The exceptions to this seem limited and capable of explanation.

§ 107. "[tʌn] (echoic word, *NED.*) a method of talk, patois (derog.)." I suggest comparison with Norw. dial. *kjangla*, 'to quarrel' ('kjævles,' says Aasen).

§ 332. "Scandinavian *v* has become [w: wa:r], 'worse,' etc. But the Scandinavian sound at the time of borrowing was *w*. And then also:

§ 334. In discussing the OE and OS combination *wr*, it is noted that *w* remained until late in the nineteenth century, then "and still appears as *v* in the Aberdeen district (*vran*, 'wrong,' *vrit*, 'write' Here it is no doubt not intended to equate Aberdeenshire *vrang* directly with Scand *vrang*).

§ 338. "f survives from Scand. *pt*: [lopt] 'loft,' etc. It might have been best to add that the *p* in such words as ON *lopt* (also spelled *loft*) was at the time of borrowing a voiceless bilabial spirant.

§ 386. Perhaps the word [skelp] in Penrith and elsewhere in Cumberland) is not from Scand. *skelfa*, 'to strike with the hand,' and later influenced by Gaelic. *sgeilp*, 'a stroke,' but simply the latter word used (both as noun? and) as a verb.

§ 420. It is difficult to see what is meant by the statements: "An initial [k] has arisen before [r] in [kran/], 'to crunch.' Cf. 16th cent. Du. *schranzen*, 'to break,' 'tear,' MHG. *schranz*, 'breach,' 'split,' Mod. Du. *schranzen*, 'to eat voraciously.' Onomatopoeic modification of *crash*, *cranch* (*scranch* or *crunch*) between the teeth." Then follow references to such variant forms as *crab* and *scrab*, *NED.* I take it that what is meant is that Penrith [cran/] is from MDu. *schranzen*, with loss of initial *s*, so that now we have initial *kr* for older *skr*. This would seem to be correct, but it does not sufficiently explain things. There should have been some mention made of the very general and wide-spread opposite tendency in English dialects of forming doublets with initial *sc*(*sk*), to words with original *k*, as *sker*, 'left-handed,' and *car*; *pink* and *spink*, etc. See the long list of such in *Wright*, § 323. Naturally this sort of a thing would also lead to doublets of words having original *sk*, especially in certain regions. [Kran/] would seem to be such a case.

But I do not wish to seem to be finding fault with a good study, undertaken after a great deal of careful work, and carried out with industry and scholarship. The matters spoken of are minor faults that do not mar much the usefulness of the book. It is an excellent feature that in the description of the sounds, and tables of OE sources, pp. 3-24, phonology of the vowels, pp. 24-88, and the consonants, pp. 88-135, accident, pp. 136-172, specimens of the dialect, pp. 172-177, and the glossary, pp. 179-214, every Penrith dialect word is recorded in transcription.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Illinois.

RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

Among the works published in 1927 concerning the history of prose fiction before 1800, the most generally important is *The Light Reading of Our Ancestors: Chapters on the Growth of the English Novel* (Brentano). Its author, Rowland Edmund Prothero, Lord Ernle, best known as the editor of Byron, has for more than sixty years been a devoted reader of the prose fiction of former generations. Forty years ago he began to publish articles thereon, which now would fill more than three volumes. These studies he has condensed into one volume. Although the author himself would deprecate the claim, this book will probably be regarded as a history of English fiction from its beginnings to Sir Walter Scott. Indeed, in a few particulars, it is a nearer approach to a good history of that subject than any other book. In two respects especially it deserves the highest praise: it is based upon the sources themselves, that is to say, upon a wide reading of the prose fiction from the earliest times; and the choice of the reading has been determined not by the author's personal likings alone, but by a sincere desire to discover what were the likings of "our ancestors." Some of our histories of prose fiction do justice only to such novels as their modern authors themselves found still interesting; but Lord Ernle has read much which he himself must have found dull, in a patient effort to determine why his forbears delighted therein. Some of his chapters therefore describe, from first-hand knowledge, once popular works now almost forgotten. This is especially true of his accounts of the fiction of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Such a chapter as, for example, "A Book-Box of Novels (1689-1724)," describes at first hand works like *Cynthia*, *The History of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex*, *The Irish Rogue*, *The Siege of Mentz*, and *Lindamira*, for mention of which the student will look in vain in other brief accounts. Lord Ernle has also read sympathetically although critically, the forgotten novels of the latter part of the eighteenth century.

The literary criticism, moreover, is on the whole admirably sound. Lord Ernle's wide interest in many aspects of life and letters, his travels, his expert knowledge of non-literary pursuits such as agriculture, have enlarged his sympathies and prevented his judgment from being narrowly bookish; while his studies in such widely different literary works as the Psalms, the works of Gibbon, and the poetry of Byron, have broadened his taste. His chapters upon Petronius and Apuleius, particularly the latter, are remarkably fine pieces of criticism; and his appreciation of Fielding is, in my opinion, one of the best brief introductions to the personality and works of that novelist. I am inclined to believe that none of

the short histories contains as useful an introductory account of the period from 1580-1719.

Since the merits of Lord Ernle's work will, in spite of his modest disclaimer, give his readers the impression that it is an adequate history of prose fiction, it is necessary to point out its limitations. In the choice of authors and topics treated, there are grave inconsistencies. It was well to give space to such foreign works as the Greek Romances, Petronius, Apuleius, Boccaccio, D'Urfé, Mme. de La Fayette, and Scarron; but a distorted view of foreign influences is conveyed by the omission or neglect of such equally important works as *Cyropaedia*, *Lazarillo*, *The Arabian Nights*, *Contes de Ma Mère L'Oye*, and *Gil Blas*. The list of medieval prose fictions is very seriously defective: nothing is said of the Saints' Legends, nor of the exempla; Geoffrey of Monmouth is grossly neglected; and there is no account of *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Reynard the Fox*, the *Ancren Riwe*, or *Fulk Fitz-Warine*. The description and discussion of the prose tales of the sixteenth century, and of the jest books, is inadequate; there is nothing or too little concerning *Robert the Devil*, *Helyas*, *Vergilius*, and *Hamblet*. The only mention of More's *Utopia* is a casual one in the chapter on Richardson. For these reasons alone, Lord Ernle's book cannot take the place of reasonably comprehensive sketches of the history of prose fiction such as Professor Saintsbury's or Professor Cross's.

The work has no bibliography. Indeed it is evident that Lord Ernle is but slightly acquainted with modern research in the history of prose fiction. Of American contributions he seems entirely unaware. Consequently he omits mention of historically so significant works as Grange's *Golden Aphroditis* and Kirkman's *Counterfeit Lady*; and he repeats the old errors that Mrs. Behn was in Surinam, and that Defoe wrote *The Storm* while in jail. The chapter on Defoe is remarkably weak, making no use of the light which American scholars have shed upon Defoe's sources and methods. In general, Lord Ernle is better in describing the nature of the fictions he deals with than in disclosing their provenience and manner of composition. The book is an excellent illustration of the truth that is impossible to write a good history of prose fiction nowadays without dependence upon the labors of other scholars.

The chief doctrine of Lord Ernle's work is that the main tendency in prose fiction has been "the gradual growth of the perception that truth to life is the aim of novelists." Lord Ernle tends to appreciate the merits of realistic fictions more than the merits of romances, a preference somewhat dangerous when dealing with a genre in which the romantic and fantastic down to our own days have flourished as much as the realistic and naturalistic.

Comparatively little work appeared during 1927 on the prose fiction of the Middle Ages. Professor Gerould emphasized anew

that what Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote was essentially what we should to-day term, I suppose, an historical novel with a political tendency.¹

Professor T. Atkinson Jenkins' presidential address before the Modern Language Association, *On Newness in the Novel*, carefully traced the history of the word *novella* up to Boccaccio. He showed that in Old French and Provençal as well as in Italian the tendency was to understand by that word a tale with a memorable saying or witty retort; and that in the *Decameron* twenty tales are of that type, while dialogue is prominent in all of them. This is a real contribution to the origins of the modern idea of the novel. There is need, as Professor Jenkins remarked, of a thorough study of the history of dialogue.

Erasmus, despite the *Praise of Folly* (translated in 1519), and despite his fondness for introducing fictitious narrative into other works of his, has been persistently ignored by historians of prose fiction. His contributions to the genre, and his influence upon it, have also been neglected by his biographers. An opportunity to be the first to give him his just dues in this connection was therefore open to John Joseph Mangan, M. D., in his two-volume *Life, Character, and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus*. Dr. Mangan describes the *Praise of Folly* and the *Colloquies* at great length, but shows no interest in their literary character. He is preoccupied with a medical interpretation of Erasmus' temperament, and especially with a sectarian defense of his church against Erasmus' satires upon ecclesiastical evils. He seems unaware of those changes in taste and in manners which the critic of older literature must not forget. His zeal prompts him to term the *Praise of Folly*,—one of the great liberalizing masterpieces of humanism,—“this inconsequent and silly, not to say blasphemous work,” and to opine that “Erasmus was not normal when he wrote it, and still less so when he published it.” What he stresses in the *Colloquies* is their alleged “monacophobia” and “obscenities.” “The tone of his work,” we are told, “was essentially lewd in parts. . . . This moral obliquity in Erasmus is astonishing, and can only be explained on the theory that he was born with a moral strabismus.”² This unsavory union of the bigoted with the clinical can hardly result in enlightenment.

Professor N. H. Clement, who recently published a study of the form of Rabelais' romance, has now analyzed its philosophy in a cautious and painstaking article, “The Eclecticism of Rabelais”

¹ *Speculum*, II, 33-51.—See Professor Nilze's comment thereon in the same volume, 317-321; and Professor A. C. L. Brown's, 449-455.—Professor J. J. Parry finds the source of the name Lucius in Josephus; *ibid.*, II, 446-447.—All books and articles referred to in this survey are of 1927 unless otherwise stated.

² Mangan, J. J.; *Erasmus* (Macmillan) I, 312; II, 138, 148, 149.

(*PLMA.*, XLII, 339-384). The dispute about Rabelais' meaning is very old. It even appears, in a vulgar form, in the pages of Tom Brown of facetious memory, who has Rabelais speaking of his own works as "things which some call a cock and a bull, and others the product of a lively imagination." Differing with Faguet, who doubted whether Rabelais had any philosophy at all; as well as with Abel Lefranc, who believed that he had one, and that it was anti-religious and maternalistic; Professor Clement finds Rabelais' thought in process of development from the first two books to the last three. (He holds that most, if not all, of the fifth book is authentic.) The development, as he sees it, is from Epicureanism, coarsened by hedonism, towards "a theory of life and the universe prevailingly Stoical." This seems the most plausible and best documented interpretation thus far published.

What we stand greatly in need of are careful editions of the sixteenth-century translations of foreign fictions. Especially welcome, therefore, is Peter Davies' valuable reprint of *Thirteene Most Pleasaunt and Delectable Questions, entituled a Disport of Diverse Voble Personages, Englished anno 1566 by H. G.* This translation of a long episode in Boccaccio's *Filocolo* marked an important step in the progress of Italian influence. (In passing, I may remark that it would furnish Professor Jenkins, whose article I mentioned above, with additional evidence regarding the importance of dialogue.) The present edition, furnished with an introduction by Edward Hutton, who edited the 1587 translation of *Amorous Fiametta* a year ago, is limited to 520 copies, printed in a fount reconstructed from Peter Schoeffer's ancient fount, so that its pages by their appearance as well as by their contents suggest the dawn of Elizabethan fiction.

F. C. Danchin, in "Les deux Arcadies de Sir Philip Sidney" (*Revue Anglo-américaine*, v, 39-52) tries to mediate between those who admire the *Old Arcadia* more than the *New* and those who do not. He feels that the *Old* is superior to the *New* in the simple straightforwardness of Books I and II, but the *New* superior in Book III, with its heroic note. This is confessedly impressionistic. His remarks would have been sounder on the contents of the *Arcadia* if he had read Greenlaw in the *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*; and on the form and style if he had read what Wolff, Harrison, and others have discovered concerning Sidney's models.—The remarkable fact that the *Arcadia*, although not translated into French until 1624, became the basis of a French play as early as 1605, is brilliantly proved by Professor H. C. Lancaster (*MLN.*, XLII, 2). This gives Sidney and prose fiction the leadership in introducing English influence into French literature.

The important Bunyan item of 1927 is Professor John W. Draper's "Bunyan's Mr. Ignorance" (*Modern Language Review*, xxii,

15-27). It shows that Mr. Ignorance expressed Bunyan's Calvinistic hostility to the type of person who was self-satisfied, who, Quaker-like, had no consciousness of sin, who felt himself good at heart, and who was an optimist; in other words, who was a precursor of the sentimentalist of the eighteenth century.—A unique copy of Bunyan's *Building, Nature, Excellency, and Government of the House of God*, a work believed lost, has been found at the University of St. Andrews.

Last year I called attention to the unscholarly nature of some of the *Broadway Translations*. Now in the same series there appears, advertised as if new, the *Memoirs of the Court of England in 1675* by Marie Catherine Baronne d'Aulnoy, "translated by Mrs. W. H. Arthur, edited and revised with notes by George David Gilbert." The words "and revised" are misleading, if not dishonest. On the reverse of the title-page there is found the confession: "First edition, 1913; second impression, 1927." This is indeed a mere reissue of the edition of 1913, on the title-page of which likewise appeared the assertion "and revised," signifying apparently that Gilbert had revised Mrs. Arthur's manuscript translation. The edition of 1913 itself was a typical exhibition of amateurishness, displaying a fond credulity, and naively declaring, "Mme. d'Aulnoy has a most undeserved reputation for inaccuracy. It will be seen that the notes corroborate every statement that she makes, even to tiny detail." The notes betray an inability to appreciate what constitutes sufficiency of evidence. In truth, to anyone versed in the narratives of this period it seems *prima facie* likely that the *Memoirs of the Court of England* is nothing else than an imaginative story exploiting notorious incidents, rumors, and characters of the Restoration period; i. e., it is a *chronique scandaleuse*, a form of prose fiction. To ignore this likelihood in 1913 was bad enough; to reissue in 1927 the work in a series which proclaims that "the editions shall be definitive," is outrageous. For in the meantime the suspicions regarding the fraudulent character of Mme. d'Aulnoy's narratives of this sort have grown stronger. In January, 1927, the erudite Hispanist, M. R. Foulché-Delbosc published his scholarly edition of Mme. d'Aulnoy's *Relation du Voyage d'Espagne*. In it he proved overwhelmingly that, although her assertions of the truth of her narrative are loud and long, she took her vivid Spanish scenes, incidents, and characters from the plays, novels, and letters of others, and that she had probably not even visited Spain! Had she visited England? Are the publishers of this edition warranted in advertising these *Memoirs* as "a valuable picture of Charles II's court"? The problem is of some importance, if only in its bearings on the methods of Defoe.

Substantial contributions have been made to Swift scholarship. Miss Marguerite Hearsey has demolished the argument which was

chiefly depended upon by those who doubted Berkeley's testimony that Swift married Stella. She demonstrates that Berkeley actually could have been told of the marriage, as he said he had been, and was not abroad at the time. She shows that the biographer of Berkeley made a mistake, regarding the date of Berkeley's foreign sojourn, in his first edition; and corrected it in his second (*PMLA*, XLII, 157-161). It will be interesting to learn whether Miss Harsey's discovery will modify the views of M. Pons, who in the first volume of his *Swift* (pp. 96, 119, 124) relies, like his predecessors, upon the first edition of Berkeley's *Life*.—Our knowledge of the history of the text of *Gulliver's Travels* is fortified by Harold Williams' definitive edition of the first edition, with a very important introduction.³ Elsewhere he discusses the *Canon of Swift* (*RES*, III, 212-214). M. Émile Pons's school edition of *Gulliver* (Hachette) is superior to any English one of the kind in its introduction, bibliography, and notes. He discusses the language of the Lilliputians in the *Bulletin de Strasbourg* (v, 221). Lucius L. Hubbard, in a privately printed pamphlet, describes two Robinsonades published together in 1719: *James Dubourdieu*, which Swift may have borrowed details from; and *Alexander Vendchurch*, which recalls the controversy about *Krinke Kesmes* and Defoe.

The old error that Defoe wrote *The Storm* in prison has reappeared, not only in Lord Ernle's book, but also in G. D. H. Cole's edition of *A Tour Through Great Britain*, and in the Shakespeare Head Press *The Shortest Way*; but Dr. A. W. Secord has again refuted it.⁴

Mr. Bonamy Dobree provides a good introduction to the new translation of *The Sofa* by Crébillon, who certainly influenced Sterne, perhaps Smollett's *Memoirs of a Lady*, and probably other English novels. Mr. Dobree laments that English fiction lacks the subtle studies in "l'amour gout et l'amour passion" provided by Crébillon, Bibiéna, de la Morlière, de Bouffiers, and the Marquis de Sade. Mr. Aldous Huxley, in *Essays New and Old*, characteristically praises Crébillon for his "complete absence of moral 'prejudices,'" and as "an expounder of the scientific truth about love—that its basis is physiological; that the intense and beautiful emotions which it arouses cannot be philosophically justified or explained, but should be gratefully accepted for what they are."

In the *History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia*, edited by R. W. Chapman, we have the most accurate account of the circumstances under which Johnson wrote the tale, and of the relation of the first six editions to each other. Another expression of Johnson's

³ *Gulliver's Travels: the text of the First Edition, with an Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes* (First Edition Club), 1926.—See the review by Émile Pons, *Revue Anglo-américaine*, v, 158-160.

⁴ *Times Literary Supplement*; January 26, 1928.

sense of the vanity of human wishes is given in his mournfully beautiful tale, *The Fountains*, nowadays too little read, and recently reprinted in the Baskerville Series.

The Shakespeare Head Edition of Sterne, in seven volumes, is the first complete one since Professor Cross's in 1904. A convenient issue in one volume of *The Sentimental Journey*, *The Journal to Eliza*, and the *Letters to Eliza*, has appeared in *Everyman's Library*, with an introduction by Professor Saintsbury, which learnedly (though none too clearly) sets forth some problems of Sterne's life and character. An admirable appreciation of Sterne, which appeared *à propos* of that edition in the *Times Literary Supplement* of May 26, led to a dispute in its columns concerning the authenticity of some of the letters published as Sterne's. Two books are preparing on this subject,—one by Miss Margaret R. B. Shaw, who regards the letters of 1740 as genuine; and one by Mr. Lewis P. Curtis of Yale, who thinks they were forged by Sterne's daughter, and who has also investigated those forged by Sterne's editor, William Combe.⁵ Until this problem is settled not only will such a careful edition as Mr. R. Brimley Johnson's *Letters of Sterne* be clouded by uncertainties, but the conduct of Yorick must remain dubious in significant respects.

A new edition has appeared of Mrs. Frances Sheridan's *History of Nourjahad*, an ingenious story with a crudely expressed moral.—Dr. Helen Scurr's thesis, *Henry Brooke*, contains a chapter on the novels, which is appreciative of their faults and merits rather than informatory about their historical relationships. Its best feature is a succinct contrast between *The Fool of Quality* and the works of Rousseau.—In *The Anecdotes and Egotisms of Henry Mackenzie*, very well edited with a charming introduction by Professor H. W. Thompson, there is published for the first time a miscellany in which, among other interesting materials, appears an account of the circumstances under which *The Man of Feeling* was written. The volume contains notes on Sterne, Rousseau, and Roy Roy. A biography of Mackenzie, and an edition of *The Man of Feeling*, are soon to be issued by Professor Thompson.

William Godwin's *Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft* have been edited by Mr. W. Clark Durant. The text seems rather carefully reprinted from the first edition, and the variant readings of the second are noted. Blake's illustrations of Mary Wollstonecraft's stories, some of them rare, are reproduced. The rest of the volume, a supplement which Mr. Durant describes as "chronologically arranged, and containing hitherto unpublished or uncollected material," and which is much longer than the memoirs themselves, is a strange mass of materials, thrown together with little care, judgment, or plan. Its amateurish errors have been so sufficiently

⁵ Cf. Clark, Edwin; in *New York Times Book Review*, January 15, 1928

chastised in the *Times Literary Supplement* for June 23rd, as to make it unnecessary to do more here than to warn against depending upon its records and assertions.

In the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1927, Mr. Michael Sadleir published a study of the seven "horrid" novels scornfully named in Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*, identified all but one of them, and made some suggestive generalizations concerning what he called the Gothistic epoch (1775-1815). Soon afterwards Robert Holden & Co. announced that the "Jane Austen Horrid Novels" would be republished with introductions by the Rev. Montague Summers; and the first two have appeared, *Horrid Mysteries*, a translation from the German by Karl Grosse; and *The Necromancer of the Black Forest*, which pretends to be by a German, and may be based on German lore.

We also have, in an unduly expensive volume of nearly four hundred large pages, *The Haunted Castle: a Study of the Elements of English Romanticism* (Routledge) by Eino Railo, who began his work under the guidance of Professor Yrjö Hirn of Helsinki University, Finland. The purpose of this book is "to serve as a guide to English horror-romanticism" from c. 1760 to c. 1840. Large portions of the volume deal with prose fiction. It begins with Horace Walpole, Clara Reeve, and Ann Radcliffe, describing the stage settings of their novels, and their typical landscapes, villains, tyrants, heroes, heroines, sentiments, etc. Next it presents in detail the life and works of 'Monk' Lewis; describes the haunted castle and similar properties in the novels of Scott, Shelley, and Maturin; and devotes separate chapters to the subsequent history of such features of Lewis' masterpiece as the criminal monk, the wandering Jew, the 'Byronic' hero, ghosts and demons, incest, etc. It ends with an analysis of the means by which the "terror-romantic" authors sought to evoke suspense and horror. The description of the contents and materials of the novels, some of them not well known, is often useful and praiseworthy, as is the pointing out of resemblances in themes; but of course what professes to be a piece of literary history must be something more than a description of successive phenomena.

The real merit of this ambitious work should be determined by comparing its actual achievement with its stated intentions. Postulating that the materials of which the haunted castle with its appurtenances and denizens is the center, constitute the essentials of "Horror-Romanticism," Dr. Railo pretends to set forth (1) the causes of the movement, (2) its rise, and (3) its influence. The third of these purposes,—specifically, the tracing of Lewis's influence upon later writers, or at least the recognition in later writers of similar themes,—has been well achieved. Indeed, in my opinion this would have been a much better book if it had been conceived as a monograph on the life, works, and influence of 'Monk' Lewis.

But the second of his purposes, the tracing of the development from Walpole to Radcliffe and Lewis, can hardly be said to have been perfectly attained because of the many gaps in his history. And in the first, and perhaps the most important, of his purposes,—the search for the origins and causes of the “horror-romantic” novel,—he fails utterly.

As Dr. Railo's extensive notes show, he is widely read in German studies of the romantic movement; and he knows a good deal at first hand concerning English and German romantic novels. Unfortunately, however, he is not well versed in the French prose fiction of the eighteenth century, a fatal weakness, since the immediate causes of the movement he is studying lie precisely there. The best he can do, in speculating upon the origins of the haunted castle is to refer to such remoter causes as Spenser and Shakespeare; and even in this connection he is unacquainted with the work that Miss C. F. McIntyre has done on that aspect of the matter. To perceive the fundamental weakness of his book, we must turn to an American study likewise published in 1927, Dr. James R. Foster's “The Abbé Prévost and the English Novel” (*PLMA.*, XLII, 443-64), which throws more light upon the origins of the Gothic novel than Dr. Railo's entire volume. Even though Dr. Railo was unable to profit by Professor Foster's study, he should have known Dr. B. M. Woodbridge's article upon the Abbé Prévost, published in 1911, or Étienne Servais' *Le Genre Romanesque en France*, published in 1922, either of which would have given him the clew to the historical causes and links which he was seeking. As Professor Foster brilliantly expounds, in what is the most valuable contribution to the study of eighteenth-century prose fiction made in 1927, even predecessors of Prévost had employed the “ghost haunted Gothic Chateau;” and it was Prévost who developed what Dr. Railo calls the “synthesis of horror romantic material” in many specific particulars. He has marvelous and moving adventures, the supernatural, portentous dreams, ruined castles and dungeons, ghosts, lugubrious and melancholy settings, and historical backgrounds, as well as types of character such as ominous priests, ‘Byronic’ heroes, and perfect innocents.* Prévost or his French imitators were well known to writers like Sophia Lee, Clara Reeve, and Mrs. Radcliffe. In other words, the most important literary cause which Dr. Railo was seeking lay in the works of Prévost; and him he does not find.

He likewise overlooks the importance of Charlotte Smith, who before Mrs. Radcliffe and Lewis, wrote sentimental adventure

* Another motif found in Prévost, and later to become important,—the rebellious assertion of the rights of love against the tyranny of social convention,—is pointed out by Dr. P. Van Tieghem in “Les Droits de l'Amour et l'Union Libre dans le Roman Français et Allemand (1760-1790),” *Neophilologus*, January, 1927, pp. 96-103.

stories furnished with landscapes, castles, and ghosts. He does not discuss Sophia Lee's *Recess*, a pseudo-historical novel in which the heroines are reared in a suite of rooms concealed in a ruined abbey and reached through sliding panels and trap doors leading to a subterranean passage. Her work, as Professor Foster shows, constitutes a link between Prévost and Mrs. Radcliffe. Another English novelist, who should have been considered in connection with romantic landscapes, Thomas Amory, is likewise neglected. In short, even when we grant Dr. Railo his premises (that the themes and materials are the important matter), he is not a satisfactory guide to their history before 'Monk' Lewis.

But should we grant that premise? I doubt it. I venture the opinion that the history of topics, of materials, used in literature, though perhaps ancillary, is not essentially the history of literature at all. Literature is a vision of life. The history of literature, though it must record what objective phenomena successive epochs used as materials, is primarily concerned with exhibiting the changing envisagements or interpretations of those materials from generation to generation. For example, what concerns the true historian is not so much that in the novels of both Walpole and Mrs. Radcliffe there are haunted castles as the really important fact that in Mrs. Radcliffe the supernatural is rationalistically explained away. In such significant distinctions Dr. Railo seems to take little interest. Hence I sympathize with the general tenor of Mr. Michael Sadleir's criticism of the book as "ponderous but trivial," although the word "trivial" too harshly ignores that Dr. Railo's materials may be very useful to later students. What is now needed is a philosophical history of the way in which the narrow domestic sentimentalism of Richardson developed into the broader and more adventurous sentimentalism of Prévost, and so onwards, almost by logical steps, to the complex and extravagant sentimentalism of the Gothic novelists.

A desirable supplement to Dr. Foster's study of Prévost is Dr. Tremaine McDowell's valuable article "Sensibility in the Eighteenth Century American Novel," which not only describes our early sentimental novels but also traces the English influences upon them.⁷ As one surveys the work, he is impressed by the fact that on the whole the contributions of greatest permanent value have been made in short articles rather than in books, and that the best work has been done by those who are in close contact with the present state of research in the whole field.

ERNEST BERNBAUM.

University of Illinois.

⁷ *Studies in Philology*, xxiv, 383-402.—The influence of the earlier novelists upon Irving's *Knickerbocker History* is set forth by Dr. McDowell and Dr. Stanley Williams in their excellent new edition of that classic.

The Road to Xanadu, A Study in the Ways of the Imagination.

By JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin, 1927. Pp. xviii + 639. \$6.00.

Although Professor Lowes's book on Coleridge has been out now for well over a year, and much of its material had already been set in more or less general circulation through his lectures, any attempt at a comprehensive review ought to bear the caption "First Glance." For the book does so many interesting things, and with such masses of pertinent detail, that perspective is not easy to attain even today. In what follows I wish simply to state some of the various contributions that the book seems to make—and that quite without reference to its professed purpose—and then to consider it briefly in relation to that purpose, venturing a suggestion or two as to what has been accomplished.

To begin at the wrong end: the notes, with the adequate index, form an admirable Coleridge encyclopaedia of a comprehensiveness that is a veritable marvel, considering the intensive focus of the study. Future students will undertake no piece of Coleridge research without using this volume as a reference work for bibliographical material, hints of sources, and miscellaneous details of fact and interpretation. The current interest in Coleridge means, of course, that some points in the notes are going to be significantly supplemented, and some of them modified; but they form an *opus magnum* of unquestionable importance.

Among the contributions of the text proper are some which the author specifically disavows as part of his intention. In spite of the disclaimer that stands at the close of the chapter, *The Bird and the Daemon* (p. 240), I believe that this, as well as every other chapter of the book, does add something to the beauty of the poetry on which it bears. Professor Lowes's accumulation of material from many far corners of the worlds that men have lived in physically and imaginatively has been carried to the point of a synthesis that sometimes reads almost like epic poetry; but more than this, it makes it impossible to re-read *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* without finding that the beauty of their immediate appeal has been enhanced by the account of what went into their making.

Furthermore, while Professor Lowes was, as he said, interested in the imaginative process rather than in Coleridge's theory of the imagination, and while he has excluded, as he promised (p. x), "the nebulous theory propounded in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of the *Biographia Literaria*," his book is nevertheless important for its incidental compilation of passages in which Coleridge has informally described the workings of the mind (e. g., pp. 55, 56, 61, 65, 72, 177, 192, 221, 327, 403). This compilation is differentiated from that of Mrs. Dodds, for instance, and is given unique value, by the fact that the psychological generalisations are used as

commentaries on psychological happenings that Professor Lowes has recounted in concrete detail. Consideration of these passages makes it evident that it was Coleridge the psychologist and critic as well as Coleridge the poet who insisted on accompanying the author in his work (cf. p. 434), and that he doubtless determined to a considerable extent the way in which the author imaged the imaginative processes that he was trying to describe.

And this leads, with many inexcusable omissions, to the book's professed purpose. It was not to be a conventional study of sources (p. 48); it was not to be, primarily, a study of Coleridge at all (p. 4); but rather a study of the imaginative process—a process peculiar to the poet only in degree (p. 59). Fundamentally, this is what it is. The interaction of the unconscious and the conscious, the spontaneous and the controlled, in the achievement of an imaginative work, is the reiterated theme of the book. The depths of the unconscious "are people to start out with . . . by conscious intellectual activity," and "it is again conscious energy, now of another and loftier type, which later drags the deeps for their submerged treasure, and moulds the bewildering chaos into unity" (p. 60). Between these two stages comes the "incessant activity of combination and amalgamation" (p. 63) of "the deep well of unconscious cerebration." These processes are common to all kinds of creative activity of all men, but in the case of the genius they are "superlatively enhanced." "The subliminal agencies are endowed with an extraordinary potency; the faculty which conceives and executes operates with sovereign power; and the two blend in untrammelled interplay" (pp. 431-2).

The development of this theme or hypothesis is especially commendable for the fact that the author used, as his material, objective and scientifically ascertained events—chiefly pertaining to Coleridge's reading as this was ingeniously traced, with his notebooks as a starting-point; and for the even more fundamental fact that he acknowledged that he was necessarily speaking in parables.

What is the value of the parable that he uses, of the way in which the imaginative process is imaged? It makes clear, as the author would have it, that the element of control in imaginative work need not be denied on the one hand nor explained in terms of mechanical calculation on the other. It enables him to show the organic function of design in *The Ancient Mariner* in unforgettably revealing terms. Yet, reading the book today, one realises that the science of psychology, and, what is more to the point, popular education as to the ways of the mind, have been progressing fast while Professor Lowes has been making his study. His formulations of issues occasionally suggest men of straw, and his generalizations occasionally sound as though they might have been taken for granted, even though his concrete contributions of material are fresh and stimulating in a high degree. Moreover, one of the real

psychological issues of the present moment centers on a point fundamental to Professor Lowes's choice of parables. In terms of this particular book it might be stated as follows: Does not the author's discussion of the conscious and the unconscious and their interrelations imply a mechanical conception incompatible with the organic notion that he is trying to instil? It is the perennial paradox of philosophy, of course. I can only put the question and refer to discussions by such diverse psychologists as Koffka and Watson for elucidation.¹ I believe that Professor Lowes's book went as far as the psychology current when he was shaping it would allow, and that it is doing much to make the best in that psychology more current and more concretely real; but I also believe that some of its psychological generalizations will have to be translated into other terms a little sooner than could have been anticipated even a few years ago. It is true that we are only beginning to get a vocabulary that will let us talk about, and think about, things that must be thought about more fully in connection with such a man as Coleridge: motor imagery (if we still allow imagery at all), muscular tension or strain, muscular tone, kinaesthetic images or sensations and such, as determining factors in the organic activity of imaginative creation. But we are beginning. And while it is inconceivable that we should ever get hold of such factors with anything like the definiteness with which we analyse out the visual imagery of a poem—and Heaven help us if we should! yet we may get far enough to realize a little better what does determine the behavior of the visual imagery. We may yet be able to carry the problem of art and artlessness in *Kubla Khan* a little nearer a solution than Professor Lowes has carried it (see note, pp. 567-9), and to re-image, with some modifications, the composition of a poem like *The Ancient Mariner*.

Meanwhile it must be kept in mind that Professor Lowes is offering for the psychologists material rather than conclusions (p. 344, note), and that he is himself urging the collection of supplementary material (p. xi). The book must not be considered as a more final statement than it ever intended to be. Taking it for what it actually is, designedly and fortuitously as well, one finds it affording enough to keep critics of Coleridge and other poets productively occupied for as long as they care to let it. And when its psychology has to be translated it will be found, I think, that it will bear translation.

ALICE D. SNYDER.

Vassar College.

¹ Cf. Koffka, *Structure of the Unconscious* (pp. 44-8) and Watson, *The Unconscious of the Behaviorist* (especially p. 93), in *The Unconscious, a Symposium*, ed. E. S. Dummer, Knopf, 1927. W. T. Thomas's *The Configurations of Personality* (ib.) uses *The Road to Xanadu*. See also C. F. Prescott's *Poetic Mind*, 1922, and Graham Wallas's *Art of Thought*, 1926.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

NOVEMBER, 1928

Number 7

VOLTAIRE'S MARGINAL COMMENTS UPON POPE'S *ESSAY ON MAN*

The great popularity of Pope's *Essay on Man*, in France and elsewhere on the Continent, as well as in England, is well known. Appearing first in English during the years 1733 and 1734, it was translated into French by Silhouette in 1736, by Du Resnel in 1737, and by de Seré in 1739. Several other French translations, besides reprints of those just mentioned, were published later during the eighteenth century.

Voltaire received Pope's poem (presumably only the first two epistles) as early as May, 1733,¹ if this undated letter to Du Resnel is correctly classified. For about seven or eight years thereafter (1733-1740) Voltaire, in his correspondence, commented rather frequently upon Pope and, in 1738 and 1739, paid him the homage of free imitation in his *Discours sur l'Homme*, yet even in this early period his admiration for Pope's deism was tempered by criticism of much that he considered false or obscure. By July 24, 1733, we find him writing to Thieriot in mingled English and French: "A propos d'épître, dites à M. Pope que je l'ai très-bien reconnu in his *Essay on Man*; 't is certainly his style. Now and then there is some obscurity; but the whole is charming."²

¹ Voltaire, *Œuvres* (Moland ed.), xxxiii, 339. In May, 1733, not for the first time in July, as M. Lanson implies (*Lettres philosophiques*, Paris, 1915-17, II, 146, n. 38), unless there should appear a reason for reclassifying this undated letter. The following letter of May 15 to Thieriot, with its mention of "le poème de Pope sur les Richesses" (Moland, xxxiii, 341), presumably refers to Pope's *Epistle, Of the Use of Riches, To Allen, Lord Bathurst*, not to the *Essay on Man*.

² *Ibid.*, xxxiii, 364.

On February 12, 1736, Voltaire wrote: "C'est un beau poème, en anglais, quoique mêlé d'idées bien fausses sur le *bonheur*,"³ and a month later, after a longer discussion of some details, he concluded: "Tout l'ouvrage de Pope fourmille de parilles obscurités." It is true he added, mingling praise and blame as he had already done with Shakespeare: "Il y a cent éclairs admirables qui percent à tous moments cette nuit."⁴ In 1754 Voltaire still calls it "le premier des poèmes didactiques, des poèmes philosophiques,"⁵ and echoes much of Pope's attitude in his *Poème sur la Loi naturelle* of 1752. Moreover, it should be remembered that the philosophic Optimism of Pope fused with that of Leibnitz had won the adherence of Voltaire's mistress, Mme du Châtelet, who exerted so much influence over him during the years together at Cirey.

But, as Voltaire grew older, the facile optimism which had satisfied him in his *Discours sur l'Homme* of 1738 and to which he had given partial expression also in *Zadig* of 1747 no longer was adequate to still his doubts. The death of Mme du Châtelet in 1749 removed from his side an ardent defender of Leibnitz. Voltaire's unhappy experiences in Germany, culminating in 1753 with the break between him and Frederick, his extensive reading of the wickedness and folly of mankind in preparation for his *Essai sur les mœurs*, perhaps also ill health, all inclined him still further toward a pessimistic interpretation of the realities of human existence. Then in 1755 the terrible earthquake at Lisbon provided the occasion, though not the cause, first for his *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne* of 1756, where his tone was serious and still respectful toward Pope but critical of current interpretations of evil and suffering, and finally three years later for *Candide*, where the mockery of Optimism is sardonic, and bitter, and peculiarly effective.⁶

Such, in briefest outline, is the history of Voltaire's attitude toward Pope. It offers the background necessary for the clearer understanding of his marginal comments upon his copy of the *Essay*

³ *Ibid.*, xxxiv, 30.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xxxviii, 219.

⁶ This paragraph is mainly based upon part of M. André Morize's excellent Preface to his critical edition of *Candide*, Paris, 1913.

on Man, which is part of the private library of Voltaire, purchased, after his death, by Catherine the Great and now to be found in the Public Library at Leningrad.⁷ Voltaire owned the two volume quarto edition of Pope published in English at London, the first volume by Lintot in 1717, the second by Gulliver in 1735.⁸ All but one of his marginal notes are to be found in the second volume and these latter all deal with the *Essay on Man*. It is these marginal comments which will be presented in this article.

The first of these marginal notations in Voltaire's hand occurs near the beginning of Pope's poem at the eighth verse of the First Epistle.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 3-8)

Voltaire

Let Us (since Life can little more supply
Than just to look about us, and to die)
Expatiate free, o'er all this Scene of Man,
A mighty Maze! but not without a Plan;
A Wild, where weeds and flow'rs promiscuous shoot,
Or Garden, tempting with *forbidden fruit*.

Mais, mon cher
Pope, si c'est un
fruit deffendu, tu
n'y dois done pas
toucher.⁹

It is Voltaire who has underlined the words "forbidden fruit" to indicate the direction of his comment. Note the familiarity of the tone and the inclination to quibble over details.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 15-16)

Voltaire

Laugh where we *must*, be candid where we *can*,
But vindicate the Ways of God to Man.

Il n'y a pas là de
quoi rire; et voilà trop
d'antithèses.

The evil in the world, Voltaire hints, is too great to leave much occasion for laughter. The attack upon antitheses refers to Pope's

⁷ Professor Norman L. Torrey of Yale University and the author of this present article studied in this Voltaire library at Leningrad during the summer of 1927. A general article on Voltaire's books and marginalia will be published by them jointly in *PMLA* for December, 1928.

⁸ Besides this two volume quarto edition of Pope in English, the Voltaire library contains only: Du Resnel's translation, *Essai sur la critique*, Paris, 1730, in-12; and Genet's *Lettres choisies de Pope sur différents sujets de morale et de littérature*, 2 tomes in 1 vol., 1753, in-12. Neither of these works contains place markers or marginalia. There is no trace of the first edition of the *Essay on Man* of 1733 which Voltaire perhaps never received back from Du Resnel. Cf. Moland, *xxxiii*, 339.

⁹ Voltaire's spelling has been preserved, but not his complete lack of punctuation and capitalization.

perhaps over-numerous contrasts beginning with Line 6: a *Maze* . . . not without a *Plan*; a *Wild* . . . a *Garden*; *weeds* . . . *flow'rs*; the *open* . . . the *covert*; *latent tracts* . . . *giddy heights*; *creep* . . . *soar*.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 23-32)

Voltaire

He who thro' vast Immensity can pierce,
See worlds on worlds compose one Universe,
Observe how System into System runs,
What other Planets, and what other Suns?
What vary'd Being peoples ev'ry Star?
May tell, why Heav'n has made us as we are.
But of this frame the bearings, and the Ties,
The strong connections, nice dependencies,
Gradations just, has thy pervading soul
Look'd thro'? or can a Part contain the Whole?

No, but a part can
canvass the laws of the
whole.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 35-38)

Voltaire

Presumptuous Man! the Reason would'st thou find
Why form'd so weak, so little, and so blind?
First, if thou can'st, the harder reason guess
Why form'd no weaker, blinder, and no less?

J'ay dit cela il y a
quarante ans.

In 1756 Voltaire introduced into the text of the *Lettres philosophiques*, which had not previously mentioned the *Essay on Man*, a long passage of which the following is a part:

J'ai été flatté, je l'avoue, de voir qu'il [Pope] s'est rencontré avec moi dans une chose que j'avais dite il y a plusieurs années. "Vous vous étonnez que Dieu ait fait l'homme si borné, si ignorant, si peu heureux. Que ne vous étonnez-vous qu'il ne l'ait pas fait plus borné, plus ignorant, & plus malheureux?" Quand un Français & un Anglais pensent de même, il faut bien qu'ils aient raison.¹⁰

Voltaire is referring to a passage similar to Pope in his own *Remarques sur Pascal*:

L'état présent de l'Homme n'est-il pas un bienfait du Créateur? Qui vous a dit que Dieu vous en devoit davantage? Qui vous a dit que votre être exigeoit plus de connoissances & plus de bonheur? Qui vous a dit qu'il en comporte davantage? Vous vous étonnez que Dieu ait fait l'Homme

¹⁰ Voltaire, *Lettres philosophiques* (ed. by G. Lanson, 2nd ed., Paris, 1915-17), II, 139-40. (Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 145-46, notes 30, 34. Cf. also the Moland ed. of Voltaire, xxxii, 178).

si borné, si ignorant, si peu heureux; que ne vous étonnez-vous qu'il ne l'ait pas fait plus borné, plus ignorant, plus malheureux? Vous vous plaignez d'une vie si courte & si infortunée; remerciez Dieu de ce qu'elle n'est pas plus courte & plus malheureuse.¹¹

It is evident that both in the marginal comment given above and in the 1756 version of the *Lettres philosophiques* Voltaire had reference to the passage just cited from his *Remarques sur Pascal*. The statement: "Quand un Français et un Anglais pensent de même, il faut bien qu'ils aient raison," loses, however, its force, when we learn that this particular Remark on Pascal did not appear with the others in the 1734 edition of the *Lettres philosophiques*, in which, as we have seen, no mention had been made of the *Essay on Man*,¹² but was added in 1739¹³ after Pope's poem had been in Voltaire's hands for nearly six years. Instead of this being a case where Voltaire, as he suggests, has independently and antecedently expressed the same thought as his English contemporary, it appears on the contrary very clear that it is Pope who has here influenced Voltaire, and that the latter is trying to cover up his tracks. Voltaire's marginal note is of further interest as suggesting that all these marginal comments on Pope were made rather late in Voltaire's lifetime. If we take the "quarante ans," not as an accurate measure, but as expressing in round numbers a long time, then these marginal notes may probably be dated as of the Ferney period. Other evidence, as we shall see, points in the same direction.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 39-42)

Voltaire

Ask of thy mother Earth, why oaks are made

Taller or stronger than the weeds they shade?

Or ask of yonder argent fields above,

Why Jove's Satellites are less than Jove?

Ridiculous, for a satellite ought to be lesser.

Voltaire's criticism does not touch the real point at issue, which is why the relationship of satellite to planet should exist at all.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, 209. (Cf. Moland, XXII, 44, and n.)

¹² *Ibid.*, II, 146, n. 38. Voltaire, as we have seen, read the first part of the *Essay on Man* probably as early as May, 1733, but this was probably too late for him conveniently to mention the work in the *Lettres philosophiques*, which were already in press.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 209. This is the edition published by Ledet, Amsterdam, 1738-39, 4 vols., in-8. Cf. *ibid.*, I, xv.

Pope (Epistle 1, lines 43-48)

Voltaire

Of Systems possible, if 'tis confest
 That Wisdom infinite must form the best,
 Where all must full, or not coherent be,
 And all that rises, rise in due degree;
 Then, in the scale of life and sense, 'tis plain
 There must be, some where, such a rank as Man;

Yes, since he exists.

Voltaire's matter-of-fact comment reduces the whole argument to the basis of things as we know them. We know only what is and cannot know whether things are as they ought to be or not.

Pope (Epistle 1, lines 49-50)

Voltaire

And all the question (wrangle 'ere so long)
 Is only this, if God has plac'd him wrong?

No, but why he made
 him so miserable.

Voltaire's emphatic "no" occurs twice in comment upon this passage. It is found alone on the right hand margin and then a second time, with the further comment given above, on the left. Thus it is the problem of Evil with which Voltaire, here as often elsewhere, is concerned, and he intimates that Pope dodges the question.

Pope (Epistle 1, lines 57-58)

Voltaire

So Man, who here seems principal alone,
Perhaps acts second to a Sphere unknown.

No *perhaps* when we
 reason.

Whether by "a Sphere unknown" Pope here means another world with its possible inhabitants, to whom man is subordinate, whether he means that man's destiny may be governed by the stars, or whether he means God, is not clear. In Voltaire's reply we seem to see him as a convinced deist taking Pope in the latter sense. There is no doubt in his mind that reasoning must lead to the conclusion that God exists and that man is in a secondary position to Him.

Pope (Epistle 1, lines 69-70)

Voltaire

Then say not Man's imperfect, Heav'n in fault?
 Say rather, Man's as perfect as he ought;

C'est là le point de la
 question et il n'est pas
 traité.

Pope (Epistle 1, lines 77-80¹⁴)

Voltaire

Heav'n from all creatures hides the book of Fate,
 All but the page prescrib'd, their present state,

Tu parles d'esprits;¹⁵

¹⁴ Lines 77-80 in the Elwin-Courthope edition of Pope; lines 73-76 in the 1735 Gulliver edition which Voltaire used.

¹⁵ Similarly, when Locke wrote: "L'esprit peut mettre des corps en

From Brutes what Men, from Men what *Spirits* know, il faut auparavant prou-
Or who could suffer Being here below? ver qu'il y en a.

Pope (Epistle I, line 91¹⁶)

Voltaire

Hope humbly then; with trembling pinions soar; What can I hope when
all is right?

Pope (Epistle I, lines 99-112¹⁷)

Voltaire

Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutor'd mind
Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind;

Yet simple Nature to his Hope has giv'n,
Behind the cloud-topt hill, an humbler heav'n,

To be, contents his natural desire,
He asks no Angel's wing, nor Seraph's fire,
But thinks, admitted to that equal Sky,
His faithful Dog shall bear him company.

Voilà une plaisante es-
pérance de vivre éternel-
lement avec son chien.

Voltaire's irony is characteristic. He uses similar methods, much more violently and unfairly, in commenting upon his enemies, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau.¹⁸

Pope (Epistle I, lines 113-118¹⁹)

Voltaire

Go, wiser thou! and in thy scale of sense
Weigh thy Opinion against Providence:
Call Imperfection what thou fancy'st such;
Say, here he gives too little, there too much:
Destroy all Creatures for thy sport or gust,
Yet cry, if Man's unhappy, God's unjust,

Peut-on donc ne pas
gémir d'être en proie à
tant de maux? Pouras-
tu [sic] nous prouver que
tout cela est si bon?

This frequent preoccupation with the question of Evil strengthens one's conviction that these comments of Voltaire date from the period of the Lisbon earthquake (1755) or later.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 123-128²⁰)

Voltaire

In reas'ning Pride (my Friend) our error lies;
All quit their sphere, and rush into the Skies.

mouvement" (Locke, *Essai . . . concernant l'Entendement humain*, Amsterdam, 1758, II, 317), Voltaire commented: *Idée des esprits à examiner. . . Obscur et douteux.*"

¹⁶ Elwin-Courthope, line 91; Gilliver, 1735, line 87.

¹⁷ Elwin-Courthope, 99-112; Gilliver, 1735, lines 95-108.

¹⁸ As I hope to show in a forthcoming study dealing with Voltaire's *Marginal Comments on Rousseau*.

¹⁹ Elwin-Courthope, 113-118; Gilliver, 1735, lines 109-114.

²⁰ Elwin-Courthope, 123-128; Gilliver, 1735, lines 119-124.

Pride still is aiming at the blest abodes,
 Men would be Angels, Angels would be Gods
 Aspiring to be Gods, if Angels fell,
 Aspiring to be Angels, Men rebell.

Pitoiable sottise!

Voltaire scornfully rejects these references to angels and the stories of their revolt and fall, and does not tolerate Pope's use of them as a poetic device.

Pope (Epistle I, line 161 ²¹)

Voltaire

From Pride, from Pride, our very reas'ning springs;

No, but from our wants
 and from our own miseri.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 173-74 ²²)

What would this Man? now upward will he soar,
 And little less than *Angel*, would be more;

Voltaire underlined the word *angel* without comment, but doubtless from the same motive as in the passage he had just called a "pitoyable sottise." He objects to this introduction of mythical beings into a deistic and semi-rationalistic poem.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 195-206 ²³)

Voltaire

Say what the use, were finer opticks giv'n,
 T'inspect a Mite, not comprehend the Heav'n?
 Or Touch, if tremblingly alive all o'er,
 To smart, and agonize at ev'ry pore?
 Or keen Effluvia darting thro' the brain,
 Die of a Rose, in aromatic pain?
 If Nature thunder'd in his opening ears,
 And stunn'd him with the music of the Spheres,
 How would he wish that Heav'n had left him still
 The whisp'ring Zephyr, and the purling rill?
 Who finds not Providence all-good and wise,
 Alike in what it gives, and what denies?

Tout cela n'a rien
 de comun [sic] avec la
 souffrance et avec le
 crime.

Once more Voltaire returns to what is for him the central question, the problem of Evil. Until that is satisfactorily explained, Voltaire is not ready to believe that "all is for the best in the best possible of worlds."

²¹ Elwin-Courthope, 161; Gilliver, 1735, line 153.

²² Elwin-Courthope, 173-74; Gilliver, 1735, lines 165-166.

²³ Elwin-Courthope, 195-206; Gilliver, 1735, lines 187-198.

Pope (Epistle I, lines 245-46 ²⁴)

From Nature's Chain whatever link you strike,
Tenth or ten thousandth, breaks the Chain alike.

Voltaire

Cela n'est pas vrai.
La destruction du Mu-
rèsè n'a pas anéanti le
monde. Otez de ce
globe les animaux; il
n'en roulera pas moins
dans l'espace.

Voltaire attacks the idea, characteristic of the Pope-Leibnitzian philosophy, that each stage of life or matter constituted an integral and necessary part of the whole.²⁵ Each was thought to be a link in the chain of things and each must exist as it did or the whole would break.

These comments have all been upon the First Epistle of Pope's four Epistles on Man. Two more comments follow upon the Second Epistle and after that there are no others, though one passage is marked with a paper bookmark.²⁶

Pope (Epistle II, lines 101-102 ²⁷)

In lazy *Apathy* let Stoics boast
Their Virtue fix'd; 'tis fix'd as in a Frost,

Voltaire

Tout est faux dans
cet ouvrage: le stoï-
cien Caton, le stoïcien
Marc-Aurèle languis-
saient-ils dans une
honteuse apathie?

So Voltaire pours cold water upon Pope's rhetoric. He is evidently reading it with those keen, shrewd eyes whose glint still lingers for us in Houdon's famous statue. He will not easily let himself be the dupe of fine phrases, but penetrates through them to scrutinize intently the thought beneath, and often in this first part of the poem he has found it wanting. If he has not continued to annotate, it is probably not because he agreed more with the other epistles, but simply because he wearied of the task. In all

²⁴ Elwin-Courthope, 245-246; Gilliver, 1735, lines 237-238.

²⁵ Cf. an excellent article by Arthur O. Lovejoy, "*Optimism and Romanicism*," *PMLA*, XLII (Dec., 1927), with its observations on "the principle of plenitude," pp. 930-32.

²⁶ Between pp. 62-63 of the 1735 edition; Epistle IV, Elwin-Courthope, lines 95-134; Gilliver, 1735, lines 93-130. The passage was perhaps marked because of its emphasis on the sovereignty of general physical laws.

²⁷ Elwin-Courthope, 101-102; Gilliver, 1735, lines 91-92.

probability, he would not have departed from his dictum: "Tout est faux dans cet ouvrage." He had already written in 1736, referring obviously to the Fourth Epistle of the *Essay on Man*, on Happiness, that Pope's poem was "mêlé d'idées bien fausses sur le bonheur."²⁷

Pope (Epistle II, lines 131-132²⁸)

And hence one Master Passion in the breast,
Like Aaron's *Serpent*, swallows up the rest.²⁹

Voltaire

Comparaison mal
placée et prise des ser-
mons de Smalridge.³⁰

The chief interest of this comment lies in the indication that Voltaire presumably had some acquaintance with George Smalridge's *Sixty Sermons, preached on Several Occasions*, which, as it happens, were published in 1726, the very year of Voltaire's arrival in England. Bishop Smalridge was well esteemed by Steele, Swift, and other famous men of the day, including later Dr. Johnson, who praised his sermons highly. Hence, it would not have been at all strange if Voltaire, interested as he was in theological subjects, had read these sermons during, or after, his stay in England.

This completes Voltaire's marginal comments on Pope's *Essay*. There are nineteen of them in all, twelve in French and seven in English. Four of the English comments come in direct succession, the other three are interspersed one at a time in the midst of those in French. The English comments are perfectly idiomatic and show that Voltaire was able to write down his thoughts readily and correctly in this foreign language. He seems to have used here whichever language came first to mind, and, though it is not strange that his own French should be employed nearly twice as frequently, it is none the less significant that he should have used English in more than one third of the notes. There is no evidence that these marginalia were written at different times. The whole of the text covered, slightly over four hundred lines, could easily have been read, pen in hand, at a sitting. The general tenor of the comments is the same throughout, and from the reference to "il y a quarante ans" and from the preoccupation with the problem of

²⁷ Voltaire, *Oeuvres*, xxxiv, 30. Cf. *supra*, text and n. 3.

²⁸ Elwin-Courthope, 131-132; Gilliver, 1735, lines 121-122.

²⁹ *Ætodus*, vii, 12; "For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods."

³⁰ George Smalridge (1663-1719), Bishop of Bristol.

Evil, as well as from the hostile tone, they appear to date from the Ferney period. These comments do not indicate that, at the time they were jotted down, Voltaire was making a reasoned study of Pope's poem. It appears rather that one day Voltaire, rereading the *Essay on Man*, vented his spleen for a little while against the author he had formerly admired, but never unreservedly. These marginal notes, while often intrinsically unimportant, illuminate the workings of Voltaire's mind and show him coolly analytical, rationalistic, often trivial, entering into direct and familiar colloquy with his author, judging this philosophical poem strictly from the point of view of its content as a treatise on man's place and destiny and finding it in many respects wanting.⁸¹

GEORGE R. HAVENS.

Ohio State University.

A NOTE ON VOLTAIRE'S *COMMENTAIRE HISTORIQUE*.

Among the volumes in Voltaire's library at Leningrad there is a copy of the *Commentaire historique sur les œuvres de l'auteur de la Henriade* (Neufchâtel, 1776), filled with corrections and additions in Wagnière's hand-writing. This copy was procured from Wagnière and sent to Catherine II in June, 1781, three years after Voltaire's death.¹ Wagnière called it "mon exemplaire du *Commentaire historique*," or often, probably to carry out Voltaire's wishes, "mon *Commentaire historique*," for the original work passed for some time as Wagnière's own. The proposed new edition with these corrections and additions² was never published, and the *Commentaire historique* began to be considered Voltaire's own work. Wagnière abandoned his corrections along with the deception, but his additions have been printed in much the same form in the joint *Mémoires* of Longchamp and Wagnière.³ The Leningrad

⁸¹ Several valuable comments and suggestions have been made by Professor F. B. Kaye of Northwestern University, and these are here gratefully acknowledged.

¹ "Une Correspondance inédite de Grimm avec Wagnière," *R. H. L.* (1898), III, 517.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Mémoires sur Voltaire et sur ses ouvrages* (Paris, 1826), 2v. in-8.

copy reveals certain interesting sidelights on Voltaire's life and character and on the once disputed authorship of the *Commentaire historique*.

Beuchot, in his *Avertissement* to the *Commentaire historique* reprinted in the Moland edition of Voltaire's works,⁴ has given as his reasons for believing that Voltaire was the real author, two passages in which Voltaire, evidently in the heat of dictation, forgot to employ the third person: "J'étais, en 1732," wrote the author, "à la première représentation de *Zaire*." Beuchot remarks justly that neither of the supposed authors, Wagnière and Christin, was yet born at this date, and points out the same anachronism in the passage: "J'ai entendu, il y a quarante ans, cette belle chanson." Beuchot could have settled Voltaire's authorship of the treatise conclusively if he had noticed that Wagnière, in the *Avis préliminaire* to his *Additions au Commentaire historique*, categorically refers to Voltaire as "le véritable auteur."⁵ It is none the less true that Wagnière spoke of the work for many years as his own⁶ and tried to make the public so believe. To this end, certain corrections in the first edition were plainly necessary. First, he corrected Voltaire's slips into the first person, quoted above from Beuchot, removing that very apparent difficulty. And secondly, he erased all favorable references to the talents of Mme Denis, for these would contrast strangely with the apparent animus which he bore that lady in the additional notes he was then writing.

Wagnière's notes in the Leningrad copy, written in 1781 and antedating the *Additions* published in 1826, have a certain historical interest.⁷ Slightly less complete than the published *Additions*, they contain other material, of which some appears elsewhere, as in his *Examen des Mémoires de Bachaumont*, while some gives interesting details which Wagnière or his editor saw fit to delete or to modify.

⁴ I, 69-70.

⁵ *Mémoires*, I, 7.

⁶ *Mémoires*, I, 6; and Beuchot's *Avertissement* (*supra*).

⁷ They were written partly on the margin or at the bottom of the page, but often, on account of their great length, on extra pages pasted in; hence Grimm's expression in a letter to Catherine: "les commentaires sur la vie de M. de Voltaire, enrichis de cahiers manuscrits du fidèle Wagnière." *Op. cit.*, p. 517.

The important variants only will be listed below:

1.) The *Avis préliminaire* differs from that given by Beuchot as well as from that of the published *Additions*, and represents an intermediate stage. The new material appears in the second paragraph:

Je le communiquai (le petit précis historique) à mon maître qui eut la complaisance d'y jeter [sic] un coup d'oeil, et de me fournir encor quelques instructions qui furent écrites de la main de M. Durey de Morsan, beaufrère de M. de Sauvigny, Intendant de Paris.

Durey's name was one of the three that appeared in the first edition, with those of Wagnière and Christin. Wagnière abandoned this mention of Durey's collaboration in his later version.

2.) On the date of Voltaire's birth, Wagnière notes: "J'ai vu à Paris son extrait batistaire, qui porte, que M. de Voltaire est né le 20e novembre, et a été batisé le lendemain, 21e novembre, 1649." Thus, when Wagnière wrote in his *Additions*: "La vérité est qu'il naquit le 20 février 1694, et non le 20 novembre," it was on information received second-hand, and after Voltaire's death. (*Mémoires*, I, 19).

3.) At the time of his presentation to Ninon de Lenclos, Voltaire "avait à peu près treize ans;" corrected in the *Additions* (*Mémoires*, I, 20) to: "Il ne pouvait en effet avoir plus d'onze à douze ans." (See Desnoiresterres: *La Jeunesse de Voltaire*, p. 34).

4.) Wagnière gives in full the doubtful anecdote of Arouet père at a representation of *Oedipe*. This was suppressed in the *Additions*, but given with reserves in a note by the editor. (*Mémoires*, I, 22).

5.) Wagnière refers to an event in Voltaire's life "qui a fait dire à ses ennemis qu'il ne reconnaissait d'autre Dieu que l'argent." This has been softened in the *Additions* to: "que ses ennemis traitaient d'avarice." Wagnière, considered the principal victim of Voltaire's niggardliness, strove almost alone to defend his master's memory against that charge. (*Mémoires*, I, 24).

6.) No mention is made, in this earlier version, of Voltaire's travels to different German courts with de Chasot, nor of the "lavements au savon." Desnoiresterres has disproved these later additions. (*Mémoires*, I, 35, 36. Desnoiresterres, *Voltaire et Frédéric*, pp. 64-65).

7.) Wagnière gives Voltaire's facetious and daring poem to the

pope, Ganganelli. This poem, suppressed in the *Additions*, is found in Voltaire's correspondence, in a letter addressed to Cardinal Bernis. (*Oeuvres*, XLVII, 553).

8.) Wagnière refutes the charge that Voltaire was greatly chagrined at the Emperor's failure to pay him a visit while passing. This refutation is found substantially the same in the *Examen des Mémoires de Bachaumont* (*Mémoires*, I, 417), except for one striking detail. "Pendant ce temps," writes Wagnière, "l'Empereur passa; alors M. de Voltaire vint et fit avec ses mains ce qu'on appelle un pied de nez, en riant beaucoup, et se moquant de toute cette assemblée, répétant, *ne vous l'avais-je pas bien dit?*" The "pied de nez," later suppressed, did not strengthen Wagnière's case. But since it was, as M. Lanson says, "une déclaration de principes, et un affront personnel, quand le comte de Falkenstein, le futur Joseph II, ne daigne pas se détourner de sa route vers Ferney," one may be pardoned for preferring Voltaire's heroic gesture to Wagnière's well-meaning reserves. (Lanson: *Voltaire*, p. 138).

9.) Wagnière wrote of Voltaire: "Le fond de son caractère était extrêmement gai. Il était d'une politesse enchanteresse, surtout envers le sexe." The second sentence is suppressed in the *Additions*, lest weight be added to certain malicious charges advanced by Voltaire's enemies. (Cf. *Mémoires*, I, 94).

NORMAN L. TORREY.

Yale University.

L.-S. MERCIER ET L'ELEGY DE GRAY

Après avoir circulé quelque temps en forme manuscrite, sous l'égide de H. Walpole, l'*Élégie composée dans un cimetière de campagne* fut publiée à Londres en 1751, et Gray entra dans l'immortalité. Pour comprendre l'impression profonde que ce poème produisit en Angleterre, il n'est besoin que de rappeler les paroles prononcées huit ans plus tard par le général Wolfe, le conquérant du Canada, la nuit précédant la bataille où il devait trouver la mort avec son adversaire, Montcalm.¹

¹ Cf. B. Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe*, p. 487, note 1. London, W. Heineman, 1909. In-8.

Si l'engouement du public français pour les choses anglaises avait été aussi vif vers 1750 que nous le voulons bien croire aujourd'hui, l'*Elégie* de Gray n'eut pas attendu quatorze ans pour franchir le détroit. A la vérité, et en dépit des Saint-Evremond, des Van Effen, des Thémiseul de Saint-Hyacinthe, des Prévost, des Desfontaines, des Montesquieu, des Voltaire, des Arnaud, des Suard, des Fréron, et des Gerbier, les idées anglaises pénétraient bien lentement en France, alors qu'elles avaient déjà acquis droit de cité en Hollande, en Suisse et en Allemagne.

L'*Elégie composée dans un cimetière de campagne* fut enfin traduite en prose par Mme Curchod de Nasse Necker, et publiée en 1765 par la *Gazette Littéraire*, ci-devant *Journal Etranger*.

Comme si l'intervalle de quatorze années entre la publication et la première traduction française de l'*Elégie* n'était pas encore suffisant, certains manuels de littérature adoptent la date de 1768 donnée par Quérard; date erronée puisque c'est celle de la réimpression de la traduction de Mme de Necker dans les *Variétés Littéraires* de Suard et d'Arnaud.

Les traductions se succédèrent si rapidement après cette date, qu'on en comptait trente-huit et plus vingt-huit réimpressions, en 1912,² parmi lesquelles celles de Le Tourneur, de Chateaubriand,³ et de Marie-Joseph Chénier. Ce n'est qu'au commencement du dix-neuvième siècle, cependant, que l'influence de Gray se fait sentir dans le romantisme français, avec Chateaubriand et Lamartine, car précédemment les *Nuits* de Young occupaient tous les esprits.

L. S. Mercier, et c'est ce qui fait son intérêt, n'a pas attendu si longtemps pour s'inspirer de l'*Elégie* de Gray, et il semble bien qu'il l'ait le premier introduite dans le roman. Quels que soient les fautes de style et de composition, le manque de goût et les paradoxes de cet auteur "sourdelement célèbre au commencement de la Révolution,"⁴ ses oeuvres méritent plus et mieux qu'une mention dédaigneuse. Une des figures les plus vivantes du pré-romantisme français, Mercier,—et nous n'oublions pas Diderot—nous a donné, avant Sedaine, une esquisse assez réussie du drame

² Cf. C. Northup, *A Bibliography of Thomas Gray*. Yale Univ. Press, 1917. In-8.

³ *Les Tombeaux champêtres*. *Journal de Peltier*, Londres, 11 décembre 1797.

⁴ C. Monselet, *Les Oubliés et les Dédaignés*, p. 67. Paris, 1861. In-12.

bourgeois, tandis qu'il partage avec Collé et Du Belloy la gloire, plutôt douteuse, d'avoir préparé la voie au drame historique. Il est aussi, et surtout, l'auteur du *Tableau de Paris* qu'historiens et romanciers ont pillé et pillent encore à l'envi, sans même prendre la peine de le citer.

En 1767, L. S. Mercier publia *L'Homme sauvage*,⁵ alors que le primitivisme et le naturalisme de J.-J. Rousseau enflammaient tous les esprits, et que la valeur comparative du sauvage et du civilisé était devenue un des thèmes obligatoires de notre littérature.

Cette oeuvre de jeunesse eut un succès relatif, mais elle compte, néanmoins, quatre éditions au dix-huitième siècle: deux françaises, une hollandaise et une allemande. C'est en partie l'histoire du chef d'une tribu indienne décimée et réduite à l'esclavage par l'avarice et le fanatisme des Espagnols. Echappant à toute poursuite, il se réfugie dans un désert avec ses deux enfants, un garçon et une fille, qu'il élève au sein de la bonne nature. Tel le serpent de la Bible, un Européen s'introduit dans cet Eden, et pour remercier le vieux chef de son accueil fraternel, il l'empoisonne. Ce dernier meurt au milieu d'horribles souffrances, pleuré de ses enfants qui se lamentent en ayant soin de suivre de très près le texte de *l'Élégie* de Gray ainsi qu'en fait foi l'extrait suivant:

Hélas! dis-je tristement à Zaka, voilà donc l'étroite et éternelle demeure de ce père chéri? Le chant des oiseaux, la beauté de la Nature, la renaissance du jour, notre voix plaintive qui percera l'ombre de ces arbres touffus, rien ne pourra le faire sortir de ce lit effrayant: il habitera toujours avec la mort cette sombre solitude. Nous ne le verrons plus devancer le retour du soleil, respirer les parfums du matin, et d'un pas majestueux faire jaillir la rosée du sommet des fleurs. Nous ne le verrons plus errer au hasard dans la forêt, plongé dans une douce méditation, levant ses mains pures vers la voûte du firmament; rien ne peut plus réchauffer sa froide poussière! il ne nous pressera plus dans ses bras paternels, le sourire sur les lèvres et l'amour dans les yeux. O terre! conserve-le dans ton sein; si la Nature jette un cri du fond des tombeaux, qu'il voit nos larmes, qu'il entende nos gémissements, et les louanges que nous donnons à son coeur bienfaisant et sincère. Il étoit né pour la gloire et les éloges de la renommée; mais il appartient à la raison, à la sagesse, à la douce mélancolie; il aima ses enfans, ses enfans le pleureront éternellement; et; pour tout dire, il fut roi, et il eut un ami!⁶

⁵ *L'Homme sauvage*, Histoire traduite de . . . par M. Mercier. Amsterdam, Zacherie, MDCCLXVI. In-12.

⁶ *L'Homme sauvage* (1767), pp. 202 sq.

Durant plus de vingt ans, Mercier vécut dans la même maison et en étroite amitié avec le célèbre traducteur Le Tourneur; ils travaillaient souvent ensemble et échangeaient des idées. En 1767, Le Tourneur se préparait à traduire l'*Elégie* de Gray qu'il devait publier peu d'années après, et il est probable que *L'Homme sauvage* de Mercier s'est senti de ce contact. Quoiqu'il en soit, et pour la première fois, croyons-nous, l'*Elégie composée dans un cimetière de campagne* cesse d'être une pure traduction; elle entre, avec Mercier, dans notre littérature, fait corps avec l'action du roman et aide quelque peu au développement des caractères. Mercier en tire des effets littéraires assez pauvres, sans doute, et que les grands romantiques n'auront aucune peine à surpasser, mais il leur a, tout au moins, indiqué le chemin qu'ils ne tarderont pas à suivre.

EUGÈNE ROVILLAIN.

University of Michigan.

BROWNING'S FIRST MENTION OF THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES OF *THE RING AND THE BOOK*

In an article on the genesis of *The Ring and the Book* recently printed in *MLN*.¹, I have shown that Browning's letter written from Biarritz to Miss Blagden, containing his allusion to "the Roman murder story," should be dated Sept. 19, 1864, not Sept. 19, 1862. Were no new information at hand, this would place the first known reference in the poet's correspondence to the origins of *The Ring and the Book* two years later than has hitherto been supposed. But, at this point, the letter of Sept. 19, 1862 written by Browning to Isa Blagden from Ste. Marie, près Pornic, noted in my previous article, makes an *amende honorable*. It proves, convincingly, that the Biarritz letter to Miss Blagden, with its allusion to the theme of *The Ring and the Book*, cannot have been written on Sept. 19, 1862. Then, having shifted the accepted date of the first known mention, in writing, of the Roman murder

¹ June, 1928. Through the kindness of Mr. Thomas J. Wise and Mr. T. H. Hood, I have received additional evidence in confirmation of my article. Mr. Hood, who is editing the Browning letters in the Wise collection, has transcribed a number of extracts from the poet's correspond-

story, it obligingly provides us with a new and, up to the present, unnoticed reference to the documents used in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. "The wheel is come full circle" and, curiously enough in view of what has transpired, the first literary allusion of Browning to the sources of the poem is contained, as has always been supposed, in a letter addressed to Isa Blagden on Sept. 19, 1862.^{1a} Only, this initial mention of the narrative on which the poem was based, occurs in the 1862 letter written at Ste. Marie, Brittany, not in the 1864 letter written at Biarritz in the Basses-Pyrénées. Browning's reference to the source of *The Ring and the Book*, in his Ste. Marie letter to Miss Blagden of Sept. 19, '62, is, as follows:

If you see Mrs. Baker, tell her that I was quite unable to call on her during the day or two she was at Bayswater, & that I am sorry for it. Another thing, she promised to lend me a MS. account of the trial of Count Francesco Guidi for the murder of his wife, which I am anxious to collate with my own collection of papers on the subject: she told me she had lent it to Trollope, along with other documents which she thought might interest him, and that he found nothing in this subject to his purpose. Can you ask him if there was no mistake in her statement, if the account really related to *my* Count Francesco Guidi of Arezzo? Because, in that case, with her leave (which I shall beg your kindness to ask) I should greatly like to see it, would find some friend to bring me the papers and would return them safely and expeditiously.²

ence with Isa Blagden bearing out the facts that Browning was at Pornic in the autumn of 1862 and at Biarritz in the autumn of 1864. In particular, my conclusion that, after leaving Cambo on Sept. 13, 1864, Browning spent three weeks at Biarritz, writing there on the 19th the letter to Miss Blagden containing the familiar reference to *The Ring and the Book*, is substantiated by a passage in another letter to her from London dated "Oct. 19, '64": "I returned on the 11th. We stayed three weeks at Biarritz, . . . I hope to have a long poem ready by the summer, my Italian murder thing."

Besides information derived from letters in Mr. Wise's possession, I have recently found, at Baylor University, unpublished letters of Browning and Robert Lytton containing further allusions to Browning's stay at Pornic in 1862.

^{1a} It was Miss Blagden's practice to write to Browning on the 12th of each month, while he replied on the 19th. This explains the frequent recurrence of the latter date in the correspondence cited.

² *Letters of Robert Browning to Isa Blagden*, p. 65.

On his return to London, Browning found the desired manuscript awaiting him. On Oct. 18, '62, he writes to Miss Blagden from Warwick Crescent:

Thank you most truly for attending to my request so promptly, in the matter of the Account of the Murder &c. which I found on my return. Pray thank Mrs. Baker for her kindness, & say it will be particularly useful to me: it would be of little use to anybody without my documents, nor is it correct in several respects, but it contains a few notices of the execution &c. subsequent to my account that I can turn to good: I am going to make a regular poem of it³

The query naturally arises; what was this manuscript account of the trial and execution of Count Francesco Guidi which Mrs. Baker sent to the poet in 1862? In addition to the Yellow Book, Browning is known to have used what Professor Hodell has called the Secondary Source, in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. This was an Italian pamphlet, in manuscript, giving a contemporary version of the murder story, and supplementing the narrative of the Yellow Book with many important details.

A third document dealing with this famous trial was found in a library at Rome and has been printed by Professor Griffin in an English translation. But, as this manuscript was not discovered till after the poet's death, it is not one of his sources. The question, therefore, is, whether the document sent by Mrs. Baker to Browning is the Secondary Source, or a third source used by him, though unknown to us today.

The date of the discovery of the Secondary Source has been a matter of debate and uncertainty. As information derived solely from it is used freely in the first two cantos of *The Ring and the Book*, internal evidence shows that it was in Browning's hands before he began the composition of the poem. Mrs. Orr, who has translated certain passages from the manuscript in her *Handbook* to the poet's works, writes concerning it: "This pamphlet has supplied Mr. Browning with some of his most curious facts. It fell into his hands in London."⁴ Professor C. W. Hodell refers more definitely to the discovery of the document: "It was found

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68-9.

⁴ Mrs. Sutherland Orr, *A Handbook to the Works of Robert Browning* (Ed. of 1923, London), footnote to p. 83.

in London by one of Browning's acquaintances, who, knowing the poet's interest in the subject, sent it to him."⁵ Professor W. H. Griffin cites the following reminiscence, which may have a bearing on the date of the Secondary Source:

Mr. Cartwright, who spent a night or two at Warwick Crescent, about 1864 or '5, remembers that Browning then told him that he was engaged upon a poem based on the Franceschini affair, as to which, he added, he had procured further information: this would be that contained in a reprint of a contemporary manuscript pamphlet, sent him by a friend, containing an account of the murder and of Guidi's trial and execution.⁶

Mr. Arthur K. Cook, in *A Commentary upon Browning's The Ring and The Book*, has suggested a possible connection between the poet's letter to Frederic Leighton asking him for particulars about the church of San Lorenzo in Lucina, and the discovery of the Secondary Source.⁷ As has been noted, the Secondary Source contains the account of the marriage of Pompilia and of the exposure of the bodies of the Comparini within the walls of this church. Mr. Cook, therefore, conjectures that Browning's request to Leighton on Oct. 17, 1864 was inspired by the finding of this important document. He also thinks that the discovery may account, in part, for the heightening of his interest in the subject matter of *The Ring and the Book* at this particular time. There is, however, no positive evidence to prove that the Secondary Source was sent to Browning in the year 1864. Mr. Cartwright's reminiscence of 1864 or 1865 does not state how long before that, the poet "procured further information" concerning "the Franceschini affair." Mr. Cook's connection of the finding of the Secondary Source with the letter to Lord Leighton, is in the nature of a surmise. On the other hand, Professor Hodell's statement that the manuscript was sent to Browning by an acquaintance of his who had found it in London, does not quite fit in with the theory that the document obtained by him from Mrs. Baker in 1862 was the Secondary Source. The manuscript owned by Mrs. Baker was sent to Browning from Florence, and reached him on

⁵ See the preface to Professor Hodell's English translation of the Secondary Source in "Everyman's Library," 1911, p. 258.

⁶ W. Hall Griffin, *The Life of Robert Browning*, p. 230.

⁷ P. 277.

his return to London in October, 1862. Previous to this, the poet states, "she had lent it to Trollope, along with other documents which she thought might interest him." This was, presumably, not Anthony Trollope, the novelist, but his brother Thomas Adolphus Trollope, the author of a *History of Florence* and other works on Italian life of a biographical and historical character. He was a close friend both of Browning and Isa Blagden and made his home in Florence, having built a villa in the Piazza Indipendenza. It is, of course, possible that Mrs. Baker may have found the manuscript in London. But as she sent it to Browning from Florence, after it had been examined by Trollope, there is a strong presumption that it was discovered in Italy, as the nature of the document would lead us to expect. Such an assumption does not, however, disprove the identity of Mrs. Baker's manuscript with the Secondary Source. Professor Griffin and Sir Frederic Kenyon merely say that the Secondary Source was sent to the poet by a friend. Mrs. Orr's expression, "it fell into his hands in London," might readily have had its source in the dispatch of Mrs. Baker's document from Florence to Browning at Warwick Crescent, London. The detail added by Professor Hodell that "it was found in London," may easily be a slip.

The most important evidence, in this connection, lies in Browning's reference to the title and contents of Mrs. Baker's manuscript. When begging the loan of the document he calls it "a MS. account of the trial of Count Francesco Guidi for the murder of his wife." In acknowledging its receipt he refers to it as "the Account of the Murder &c." and tells Miss Blagden:

. . . it will be particularly useful to me: it would be of little use to anybody without my documents, nor is it correct in several respects, but it contains a few notices of the execution &c. subsequent to my account that I can turn to good. I am going to make a regular poem of it.*

Browning's words, "it will be particularly useful to me," and his statement that, in conjunction with his other documents, he intends "to make a regular poem of it" are worthy of note. This establishes the fact that the account of the murder which he received from Mrs. Baker was used in the composition of *The Ring and the Book*. Since the Secondary Source is the only report of the trial

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

and execution of Guidi, in addition to the Yellow Book, that the poet is known to have used, it would seem a reasonable conjecture to identify this with Mrs. Baker's manuscript. The most direct and telling evidence, however, is comprised in the comment of Browning: ". . . it contains a few notices of the execution &c subsequent to my account that I can turn to good." This is in exact accord with the supplementary matter that the poet obtained from the Secondary Source, in writing *The Ring and the Book*. In Professor Hodel's English translation of the Secondary Source, published in "Everyman's Library,"^o he has printed in italics the new material that Browning derived from it. The entire account of the execution at the end of the Secondary Source, containing about 350 words, is italicized. A comparison between this passage and the description of the execution of Guidi and his compatriots in *The Ring and the Book*, XII, 118-207, shows that the poet is following the Secondary Source almost verbatim. Browning's singling out of the notices of the execution in Mrs. Baker's manuscript as material that he "can turn to good" is, consequently, a strong argument in favour of the identification of this document with the Secondary Source.

WILLIAM O. RAYMOND.

Bishop's University, Province of Quebec.

THE GRAND SIGNIORS SERRAGLIO: WRITTEN BY
MASTER ROBERT WITHERS

The dependence of much Elizabethan and Jacobean literature upon the published accounts of travellers to distant parts of the world has long been recognised and studied; but the travellers' accounts themselves have not in all instances been subjected to a careful scrutiny, and it is not surprising therefore that much plagiarism and some false attributions of authorship have passed unnoticed. A well-known description of the Turkish court which was published by two English editors three times in the course of the seventeenth century furnishes a case in point.

^o Pp. 259-266.

The Grand Signiors Serraglio written by Master Robert Withers was first printed in the second volume of *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, 1625. Twenty-five years later another version, full of changes and elaborations, was issued under the editorship of John Greaves with the title: *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio, or Turkish Emperours Court*. A fresh edition of this was called for in 1653, and a careful reprint of the treatise took its place in the second volume of the *Miscellaneous Works of Mr. John Greaves*, London, 1737. Greaves does not mention the *Pilgrimes*, and seems not to have known that the *Description* had found an earlier editor. His text, certainly, does not rest upon the authority of Purchas, and there is no reason for doubting the good faith of his implication that his efforts had first brought the *Grand Signor's Seraglio* into public view.

Purchas introduces Withers' treatise with the following sentences:

. . . Here thou hast the Rarities of that Great Palace for the Matter and Arte, with the representation of the Turkish Court; the Rites prophane and devout, solemne and private of the Grand Signior and all his Grandes: the Sultanas, the Women and Virgins, the Sonnes and Daughters Royall, the Great Officers of State, and of the Houshold, their Courts, their admirable Discipline, with other Observations such as I thinke (for a great part of them) have not yet seene the publike light in any Language. These hath Master Robert Withers collected: after his ten yeeres observation at Constantinople, where he was educated by the care and cost of that late Honourable Embassadour from his Majestie, Sir Paul Pindar, and well instructed by Turkish Schoolemasters in the Language, and admitted also to further sight of their unholy Holies then is usuall. But why doe I hold thee longer from the Author himselfe; yea, from this promised Serraglio?¹

In offering his *Description* 'to his Honoured, and truly Noble Friend, George Tooke, Esquire,' Greaves wrote as follows:

. . . I assume nothing to my self, either as Author of the discourse, or as Polisher of it; but onely an humble desire of publicly expressing my obligations to You. It was freely presented to me at *Constantinople*, and with the same freeness I recommend it to the Reader. The name of the Author being then unknown, upon inquiry I finde it since to be the worke of Mr. *Robert Withers*; who, by the favour of the English Embassador, procuring admittance into the *Seraglio* (a curtesie unusuall) and by

¹ *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (a reprint of the first edition of 1625). Glasgow, 1905. ix, 321-22.

continuance many years in those parts, had time, and opportunity, to perfect his observations. To him therefore are solely due the thanks of the labour; to me it is sufficient that I have faithfully discharged my trust, in publishing since the Authors death, the fruits of his travails. . . .²

Now with regard to Robert Withers, whose name is so lightly touched upon in both these passages, the oracles are dumb. The available sources of biographical information supply no clue which goes beyond Greaves' account; and Greaves adds nothing to Purchas except the hint that Withers was dead in 1650. Those details which can be verified concern not Withers but his benefactor. Sir Paul Pindar, ambassador to Turkey from 1609-20, was renowned for his generosity in educating young men at his own 'care and cost,' and Robert Withers, as one of the recipients of this bounty, may well have learned the Turkish language, and even become a privileged observer of 'unholy Holies' under the nobleman's patronage. But however that may be, in the most important particular which they set down Purchas and Greaves were certainly mistaken. For Sir Paul's protégé was not the author of the treatise ascribed to him; he was, rather, the translator of an Italian manuscript which probably came into his hands during the years of his residence at Constantinople.

Of this manuscript several copies are extant, two being included in the Riant collection now in the possession of Harvard University. The better of these is in a very fair Italian hand, runs to 123 pages quarto, and bears as a title *Relatione del Serraglio del Gran Turco dell' Ill^{mo} sig^r Ottavian Bon Bailo Veneto*. The other, much less legible, is full of dialectic forms, runs to 223 pages quarto, and is labelled *Relat^{no} di Costantinopoli*, with 'par Bon, Bailo Veneto' added in a different ink.³

² It will be noticed that Greaves does not specifically state that the *Description* came to his hands in manuscript form. But if he had been given a printed copy he would scarcely have remained in doubt concerning its authorship; nor, in all likelihood, would he have prided himself on 'communicating to the world' a work already published.

³ Both these manuscripts contain considerable matter not printed in the version of Berchet. The first one mentioned above ends with an account of ceremonies connected with the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, a description of Turkish dress, and some remarks concerning Oriental sleeping customs. Some of these final paragraphs closely parallel others which occur earlier in the treatise. The second manuscript includes, at the end of the text

Working from other copies, Guglielmo Berchet edited and for the first time published Bon's treatise in Italian at Venice in 1865 under the title *Il Serraglio del Gransignore descritto da Ottaviano Bon, Barlo Veneto a Costantinopoli nell'anno 1608*. Subsequently it was issued among the *Relazioni lette al senato dagli ambasciatori veneti nel secolo XVI*, Serie V, Venezia, 1872.⁴

In a brief memoir prefixed to *Il Serraglio del Gransignore*, Berchet succinctly summarizes the important particulars of its author's life. Ottaviano Bon was ambassador from Venice to Spain, the Porte, and France successively. He was resident as Bailo in Constantinople from 1604-1608, and performed his duties there with distinction. Profiting by the excellent opportunities which his position afforded him for observing the state of the Ottoman court, he wrote not only his description of the seraglio, but also a *Saggio delle massime fondamentali del governo ottomano*.⁵

Withers' English version does not correspond exactly with the text printed by Berchet, nor with either of the manuscripts in the Riant collection, and the three Italian versions by no means precisely agree with each other. The differences are not, however, large, and may be briefly described.

To Withers, apparently, is due the division of the work into chapters and the addition of suitable chapter-headings. Probably he added very little else, though one short anecdote and a comment or two which are nowhere paralleled in the Italian seem to have been original contributions.⁶ The translation is fairly close, and mistranslations are not numerous. Only occasionally did the Englishman allow himself the liberty of transposing, expanding, or condensing.⁷ A few Italian words he took over without change,

proper, several pages of notes and tables dealing with the accounts and officials of the Ottoman realm. My thanks are due to Professor G. B. Weston, who generously aided me in deciphering some parts of the manuscripts.

⁴ Berchet knew of manuscript copies in the library of Count Manin and the library of Count Recanati. He does not tell upon what copy he based his text.

⁵ Printed in the *Relazioni lette al senato*, Serie V, i, 116 ff.

⁶ The anecdote is found in Purchas, ix, 401: "I remember once," etc. The comment (p. 370) on Turkish doctors, "Neither doe I hold their skill sufficient to prepare Medicines for every Maladie," is Withers' own.

⁷ For examples of transposition, cf. Purchas' text, p. 324, paragraph

but whenever occasion demanded he was careful to convert Italian terms into equivalents which would be more readily understood by his readers.⁸ The greatest discrepancies occur in the statement of numbers, and there is considerable variation in the lists of officers and supplies.⁹

It is impossible to speak with complete assurance regarding the changes made by Withers because of the impossibility of reconstructing in detail the text from which he worked. The most satisfactory way of gaining an idea concerning the relation between the English and Italian versions is to read and compare typical parallel passages selected from them. Here is an excerpt from Withers' final chapter, in which he treats of Turkish 'Religion, Opinions, Persons, Times, Places and Rites Sacred':

They also affirme Gods Power to bee such, that after mens Bodies are risen againe, hee will give them such an agilitie, that they shall bee able in a moment to passe from one Heaven to another, even to the farthest parts of them, to visite and imbrace their Wives, Mothers, Brothers, and others of their Kindred, the Heavens being all transparent, being of Diamonds, Rubies, Turkesses and Christall.

2, with Berchet, p. 14; Purchas, p. 381 (beginning of Chap. x) with Berchet, p. 53; Purchas, p. 402, end of paragraph 2, with Berchet, p. 65. The enlargements which might be credited to Withers on the basis of Berchet's text have, in each of the dozen cases examined, full *manuscript* authority. For apparent omissions cf. Purchas, p. 335, last paragraph, with Berchet, pp. 22-23; Purchas, p. 405, with Berchet, p. 67. The omissions in Withers' translation are in general trifling.

⁸ Withers uses 'alla mutesca' several times, e. g., on p. 363. The 'Bailo of Venice' appears on p. 376. But '7 in 8000 cilld, che può essere in circa stara 3000 veneziane' becomes 'seven or eight thousand Keeloes, which makes almost so many Bushels of ours here in London,' p. 376.

⁹ A few examples will suffice: Purchas, p. 326, 'thirtie, or thirtie-five very brave Horses'; Berchet, p. 16, '25 in 30 cavalli.' Purchas, p. 338, 'about two thousand persons men and women, whereof the women . . . may bee about eleven or twelve hundred'; Berchet, p. 24, 'fra uomini e donne il numero di 5000: le donne saranno da 3000 in circa.' Purchas, p. 357, 'eight Aspers per diem'; Berchet, p. 37, '40 aspri al giorno'; Purchas, p. 390, 'seven Wives'; Berchet, p. 56, 'quattro mogli.' The list of officials given by Withers in his sixth chapter, p. 358, varies considerably from that in Berchet, p. 38. Both the manuscript versions are at this point nearer to Withers' account, though they do not exactly parallel it, or each other. The lists in Withers' ninth chapter, p. 379, in Berchet, p. 52, and the manuscripts, are in closer, though not in precise, agreement.

As concerning Gods Throne or Seate of Majestie; they affirme, that every one cannot behold it, by reason of the brightnesse of the beames which comes from his Eyes, and by reason of the unspeakable splendour proceeding from his glorious Face, and that the Angels and Prophets onely, have the grace to enjoy that sight.

These are the principall foundations of their Religion, upon which they build the course of this their present temporall Life, and by which they hope to obtaine a Life everlasting and happie; affirmed by their Prophet, to bee full of the delights and pleasures of this World, but enjoyed in all perfection and excellencie, in a Supernaturall and Incorruptible manner.

They say, that Almighty God sent foure Prophets into the World, to instruct, governe, and save Mankind; each of them being holy, pure, and undefiled, to wit, Moses, David, Christ, and Mahomet; and that God sent to every one of them by his Angell Gabriell a Booke, that they themselves being first perfected, might the better know how to instruct the people. To Moses he sent the Teurat, that is, the Old Law; to David the Zebur, that is, the Psalmes; to Christ the Ingil, that is, the Gospell; and to Mahomet the Kurawn, that is, the Alcoran (as wee call it.) And that the three first Prophets with their people, did faile somewhat in the Lawes given them by God: But Mahomet comming last, brought a Law, more true, plaine, cleere, and sincere, in which all such as beleeve should obtayne the love of God; but they say that other Nations continue still in their errours, and having sucked of their Mothers Milke, doe not embrace the Truth; For which fault being (by right) deprived of Heaven, they have no other meanes to recover, and to come thither at the Day of Judgement, but by Mahomets protection, who is the only Intercessor and Mediator unto the Almighty God: And standing in the dreadfull Day of Judgement at the gate of Paradise, he shall be sought unto and entreated by the other Prophets to save their people also, and his clemencie shall be such, as to make Intercession for them, so that the good Christians and the good Jewes shall by his meanes obtayne everlasting Life, with perpetuitie of sensuall delights as aforesaid, but in a place apart and inferiour to the Turkes, they being beloved of God, and more deare unto him then others. The women also shall come into Heaven, but shall be in a place farre inferiour to men, and be lesse glorified.

All the Prophets are held in great honour amongst them. They call Moses, Musahib Allloh, that is, a talker with God; and Christ, Meseeh, Rooh-ulloh, and Hazrette Isaw, that is, Messias, the Spirit of God, and venerable Jesus: and Mahomet, Resul Allloh, that is, the Messenger of God. When they talke of Christ Jesus, they speake very reverently of him; and confesse that the Jewes through Envie apprehended him, and maliciously condemned him, and led him along to put him to death; but the Angels being sent from God, tooke him away from them in a Cloud, and carried him into Heaven, at which the Jewes being astonished and vexed, tooke one that was there present, and crucified him in his stead; not being willing to have it knowne that Jesus was the Messias; he being in

Heaven in company of his Brethern the Prophets, beloved of God, and serving him, as the other Prophets doc.¹⁰

These are the corresponding paragraphs from Berchet's edition, pp. 59-61, with a few variants supplied from the manuscripts in the Riant collection; the better manuscript being designated by 'A', the other by 'B':

Affermano l'ampiezza grande dei cieli, che sono di diamante, di rubini, di turchine e di cristallo, che li corpi resuscitati saranno trasparenti puri, agili, ed atti in un momento a passare da un cielo all'altro, ed a transferirsi in lontanissime parti, per visitare ed abbracciare le mogli, li padri e madri, fratelli ed altri parenti.

Del trono d'Iddio presente a tutto, e dell' assistenza e servizio degli angeli e profeti, come si dirà, rappresentano quello di che è incapace il senso e l' intelligenza umana, afirmando, che non possi esser veduto così facilmente da tutti per la lucidezza delli raggi che gli usciranno dalli occhi e per il gran splendore che manderà fuori della sua faccia, e che solo gli angeli e profeti hanno grazia di tal fruizione.

Questi sono li fondamenti principali della loro credenza, sopra i quali fabbricano il corso della loro vita temporale e corruttibile, per conseguire l'eterna, felice ed affirmata dal profeta esser ripiena di tutte le delizie di questo mondo, usate in tutta eccellenza e perfezione con modo soprannaturale ed incorruttibile.

Dicono, che tra li profeti sono stati quattro li principali mandati da Dio nel mondo per instruire, reggere e salvare il genere umano, e tutti uomini santi, puri ed immacolati: cioè Moisè, David, Cristo e Maometto; che a tutti mandò Dio per mano delli angeli un libro, perchè documentati sapessero instruire li popoli. A Moisè mandò il Pentateuco, a David li Salmi, a Cristo l'Evangeliò, ed a Maometto l'Alcorano; che li tre primi profeti con li popoli retti da loro non errarono per essere instruiti nelle leggi date loro da Dio, ma che essendo venuto per ultimo Maometto per salvare tutti con una legge candida, sincera e veridica per acquistar l'amor di Iddio: hanno errato, e tuttavia continuano nell'errore le nazioni, che seguendo il latte materno, non si sono accostate alla verità, e che per tal mancamento, essendo prive (ipso iure) del cielo avranno bisogno nel giorno del giudizio, se dovranno per grazia entrare fra li beati, della protezione di Maometto intercessore unico ed immediato presso il grande Iddio, il quale alla porta del paradiso, stando in quel tremendo giorno sarà pregato dagli altri profeti, ognuno per la salute della loro nazione, e che sarà così potente e benigna la volontà di lui, che intercederà col Salvatore la loro salute, sì che li buoni cristiani e li buoni ebrei, conseguiranno l'uso della vita eterna nelle delizie perpetue sensuali, come s'è detto, ma in luogo separato ed inferiore a' turchi, come privilegiati e cari sopra li altri a Dio. Le

¹⁰ *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, ix, 395-396.

donne saranno ancor esse ammesse in cielo, ma in luoco inferiore agli uomini, e con minor gloria.

Tutti li profeti sono tenuti da loro in gran venerazione, chiamano Moise parlador di Dio, David laudator d'Iddio, Cristo nominato anco Messia spirito di Dio. Quando parlano di Cristo, dicono tutto quel bene che si può dire d'un uomo eletto da Dio per salute del popolo; confessano che per invidia fu preso dalli ebrei e che per loro malignità lo fecero condannare e lo condussero al patibolo della morte per esser crocifisso; ma che essendo stati mandati da Dio gli angeli in una densa nube, fosse stato rapito e portato in cielo, e che detti ebrei confusi, presero uno di loro e lo crocifissero in luoco di lui, divulgando che quel tale era il Messia, che però si ritrovava in compagnia delli altri suoi fratelli profeti in cielo, animandosi e compiacendosi nel servizio di Dio.

transparenti, etc. (A) trasparenti, etc. (B) trasparentti piu aggliti piu atti.

le padri (B) omits.

e corruttibile . . . incorruttibile (B) omits.

l'eterna, felice, etc. (A) l'eterna felicità, afirmando esser quella piena perchè documentati (A) accioche amaestrati (B) p li documentti.

li pentateuco (A) Teruat, cioe la legge uecchia (B) la legge uecchia.

li Salmi (A) il Zebur, cioe li salmi (B) gli salmi.

l'Evangelio (A) l'Ingil, cioe l'euangelio (B) l'euangelio.

l'Alcorano (A) il Turcan ch'e l'Alcorano (B) il turchan cioe il ancorano.

retti da loro non errarono, etc. (A) retti da loro nō errorno per esser uisutti (B) da loro creatti ñ erano p essere uisutti.

entrare . . . beati (B) omits.

immediato presso (A) imediato appresso (B) mediatore, presso.

ognuno, etc. (A) ciascuno per la sua natione, et salute di quella.

si che li buoni cristiani, etc. (A) si che li buoni ebrei conseguirano l'uso della uita eterna nelle delitie perpetue sensuali, come anco li buoni Cristiani (B) si che gli buoni Cristiani et gli buoni ebrei conseguirano l'uno, et gli altri della uitta eterna nelle delitie perpetue sensuale come si e detto.

chiamano . . . popolo (B) omits, adding 'Cristo' before 'fu.'

Moise (A) Moise Chelimetala.

David (A) David Ambdulla.

Messia (A) Messia Russulla, cioe spirito di Dio, et Macometto Russullalla, cioe nontio di Dio.

che però si ritrovava (A) il qual percio si trono (B) che pero si trona.

In conclusion, a word must be said about the text published by Greaves. All the matter printed by Purchas, with some changes of phrase and some modernization of spelling, is included in *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio*. But in this later version, particularly in the latter chapters, there are considerable

elaborations. Many Turkish terms, with marginal glosses, are inserted, and many paragraphs are lengthened by the addition of new material. The passage quoted above, for example, is embellished and rearranged as follows:

... so that the Angels, and Prophets only, have the grace to enjoy that sight. And of the angels they report thus, that they are continually serving, and praising God, and ready to obey his will: but I have read in a book which they call *Ahvawlec kreyaromet*, that is, the state of the day of judgement; written by a famous *Sheyk* amongst them, a most ridiculous discourse of the Angel *Gabriel*. For he writes, that *Gabriel* hath a thousand six hundred wings, and that he is hairy from head to foot, of a saffron colour, having in his forehead a sun, and upon every hair a star; and that he dives three hundred and sixty times a day into *Noor dengiz*, and ever as he riseth out of the water he shakes himself, and of every drop that falls from him there is an angel made, after the likeness of *Gabriel* himself; who untill the end of the world do pray unto God, and praise him, upon their beads; and these young angels are called *Roohawneyoon*. Many such discourses there are in that book; but because they are vain I leave them to the Turks that beleieve them, especially the common sort, who think that whatsoever is written in their tongue must of necessity be true, and that they are bound to beleieve it.

They hold that in Paradise there is a tree which they call *Toobaw*, upon whose leaves are written the names of every living man; so when Gods will is that such, or such a one should die, God shakes off his leaf into Israels lap, who looks upon it, and reads it, & having seen what Gods pleasure is, he (after the party hath been dead forty days) sends an angel to carry his soul, according as the leaf shal direct him, either into heaven, or hel, for upon his leaf, not only his hower of death is written, but also what shall become of him after he is dead.

They say, that Almighty God sent four *Pegambers*, that is Prophets, into the world, to instruct, govern, and save mankinde, each of them being holy, pure, and undefiled, viz: *Moosaw*: *Dawood*: *Isaw*: and *Muhammed*: . . .

All the Prophets are held in great honor amongst them, and they never name any Prophet but they say *Aleyhoo selawm* that is health, or salutation be upon him.

They call Moses, *Musahib Alloh* that is, a *Talker with God*; and David *Hazrettee Dawood*, that is, *venerable David*, and Jesus *Meseeh*, *Roohullah*, and *Hazrettee Isaw*, that is *Messias*, *the spirit of God*, and *Venerable Jesus*; and *Mahomet*, *Resul Alloh*, that is, *the Messenger of God*.

When they talk of Christ Jesus, they speak very reverently of him . . . These are the main, and principall foundations of their Religion.¹¹ . . .

¹¹ *A Description of the Grand Signor's Seraglio*, London, 1650. Pp.

These improvements are probably not due to Greaves, who would in all likelihood have claimed the credit if he had been responsible for them. They were doubtless the work of the translator, or of some copier of his manuscript at Constantinople who took advantage of the opportunity for employing a superior knowledge of the Turkish language and beliefs.

WARNER G. RICE.

Harvard University.

NACHTRÄGE ZU HOLTEIS *BRIEFE AN TIECK*

Obgleich Karl von Holteis *Briefe an Tieck* schon im Jahre 1864 erschienen, müssen sie noch immer als die weitaus beste Briefquelle für Ludwig Tiecks Leben und Schaffen betrachtet werden. Im Laufe meiner Beschäftigung mit Tieck, die häufigen Gebrauch von Holteis Sammlung voraussetzte, sind mir in diesem Werke eine ganze Reihe von Mängeln, Irrtümern und bemerkenswerten Punkten aufgefallen. Einige von diesen möchte ich hier als Nachträge anführen und besprechen. Ich beobachte dabei die von Holtei gewährte alphabetische Reihenfolge.

1. Band I, 27. Auguste, die Holtei scheinbar nicht zu identifizieren vermag, ist Auguste Bohmer, Karolinens Kind aus erster Ehe und das Stiefkind August Wilhelm Schlegels. Waitz¹ und Schmidt¹ datieren beide diese Versepistel "Jena, im März oder April 1799". Friedrichs Antwort darauf befindet sich bei Waitz a. a. O. I, 372.

2. Band I, 41. Selbst dem flüchtigen Leser von Holtei muss es auffallen, dass der erste Brief von Beskow, am 28. Februar 1835 in Stockholm geschrieben, viel formeller ist als der zweite (S. 53), der vom Juni desselben Jahres und gleichfalls aus Stockholm stammt. Die sieben darauffolgenden gleichen in dieser Hinsicht eher dem zweiten als dem ersten. Im ersten bedient sich der Schreiber des förmlichen "Sie," in den übrigen Beskow-Briefen

169-174. No attempt has been made to record all the small variations in phraseology.

¹ G. Waitz, *Caroline*, Leipzig 1871, I, 250. E. Schmidt, *Caroline*, Berlin 1913, I, 531-533.

wird Tieck geduzt. Indessen ist nichts davon bekannt, dass die Freundschaft Tiecks und Beskows zwischen Februar und Juni 1835 besonders intim geworden wäre. Es stellt sich heraus, dass der erste Brief überhaupt nicht an Beskow, sondern an Carl Gustav Brinkman gerichtet ist. Das Original befindet sich jetzt in der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek zu Dresden und trägt deutlich die Unterschrift "v. Brinkman". Offenbar hatte sich Holtei verlesen. Im Jahre 1917 veröffentlichte O. Fiebiger den Brief wieder,² diesmal als ein Schreiben von Brinkman, ohne jedoch zu wissen, dass er bereits bei Holtei unter einem falschen Verfasser erschienen war. Später entdeckte Fiebiger sowohl sein eigenes Versehen wie auch Holteis Irrtum und machte darauf aufmerksam.³ Die übrigen acht Briefe jedoch, die bei Holtei folgen (S. 53-63), stammen tatsächlich aus Beskows Feder.

3. Band I, 123. Dieser erste undatierte Brief von Carus wird wahrscheinlich ins Jahr 1840 gehören, zumal die darin erwähnte Novelle *Waldeinsamkeit* in der *Urania* für 1841, das heisst 1840 erschien.

4. Band I, 127. Es soll Nr. V, nicht VI heissen, und der Brief auf S. 128 soll Nr. VI sein. Der hier erwähnte von Gar wird auch in einem Brief von Tieck an Carus, der sich in meinem Besitz befindet,⁴ erwähnt. Mein Tieck-Brief stellt die Antwort auf diesen Carus-Brief dar.

5. Band I, 239 ff. Diese vier Goethe-Briefe an Tieck müssen durch neue Auffindungen ergänzt werden. Leider hat aber keine vorhandene Sammlung des Goethe-Tieck-Briefwechsels Vollständigkeit erzielt. Selbst die Sammlung von Schüddekopf und Walzel⁵ übersieht einen Brief Goethes an Tieck. Das folgende Verzeichnis führt die sämtlichen uns bekannten Briefe an, die Goethe und Tieck wechselten.

Zuerst Tiecks Briefe an Goethe: 10. Juni 1798—S-W 290-291; 6. Juni 1800—S-W 292; 9. Juni 1800—S-W 292; 9. Dezember 1801—S-W 293-294; 24. Dezember 1819—S-W 297-299; 27.

² Im *Literarischen Echo*, XIX, 9.

³ Im *Euphorion*, Ergänzungsheft 13 (1921), S. 62.

⁴ Vgl. *Modern Language Notes*, XLIII, 2 (Februar 1928), S. 76-77.

⁵ *Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, 13. Bd., Weimar 1898. Die Sammlung ist im folgenden als S-W bezeichnet.

März 1822—S-W 301-302; 24. Dezember 1823—S-W 302-304; 6. September 1824—S-W 307; 5. Oktober 1824—S-W 308; 30. August 1829—S-W 309-311; 24. September 1829—S-W 312.

Dann Goethes Briefe an Tieck: Juli 1798 (Konzept)—S-W 291; 8. Juni 1800—in S-W ausgelassen, doch siehe *Weim. Ausg.* IV. Abt., 18, S. 80-81, Nr. 4254^a; 16. Dezember 1801 (?) (Konzept)—S-W 295-296, wurde nicht abgeschickt; 17. Dezember 1801—S-W 296-297; 23. Januar 1820 (Konzept)—S-W 299-301, wurde erst am 2. Februar abgeschickt; 2. Januar 1824—S-W 304-306, Nr. II bei Holtei; 9. Mai 1824—S-W 306, Nr. III bei Holtei; 9. September 1829—S-W 311-312, Nr. IV bei Holtei.

6. Band I, 245. Brief Nr. II von Grabbe trägt dasselbe Datum wie Nr. III, nämlich den 29. August 1823. Jedenfalls ist der eine oder der andere als Konzept zu betrachten. In seiner Ausgabe von Grabbes Werken (1902) druckt Grisebach jedoch beide ab und erweckt denselben falschen Eindruck, den Holtei schon durch seine Bemerkung S. 243 hervorgerufen hatte.

7. Band I, 258. Tiecks Antwortschreiben auf diesen Brief von Gries ist am 28. April 1829 datiert und wurde im *Weimarischen Jahrbuch* III (1855), S. 205, abgedruckt.

8. Band I, 304. In seinen Romantiker-Briefen (Jena 1907) druckt Gundolf diesen Brief an Hardenberg zum grössten Teil ab und datiert ihn richtig 1799. Was den Text anbelangt, so ist Gundolf aber hier wie auch sonst unzuverlässig. Er revidiert, verbessert und lasst zuweilen sogar einzelne Wendungen aus.

9. Band I, 332 ff. Ausser diesen zwei Briefen von Hebbel veröffentlicht R. M. Werner in seiner Ausgabe von Hebbels Briefen noch zwei andere, einen vom 28. April 1840 und einen anderen vom 12. Januar 1841.

10. Band II, 43 ff. Diese drei Briefe von Iffland liegen mit vielen geringfügigen Textabweichungen auch bei F. Dingelstedt, *Teichmanns literarischer Nachlass*⁶ vor. Offenbar benutzte Holtei die Originale, während Dingelstedt die Konzepte abdruckte. Ein Operettentext war nicht die Ursache jener Spannung, die zwischen Iffland und Tieck herrschte, wie Holtei irrtümlicherweise behauptet (Anm. S. 43). Es handelt sich vielmehr um Tiecks *Genoveva*.

⁶ Stuttgart 1863, S. 282 ff.

11. Band II, 83. Der von Tieck "sehr hochgeschätzte Schauspieler Herr P.", den Tieck hier Immermann gegenüber erwähnt, ist der Schauspieler Porth, wie ein Brief Dorothea Tiecks an Uechtritz vom 27. Juli 1835⁷ eindeutig beweist.

12. Band II, 152. Im Zusammenhang mit Justinus Kerners Brief vom 14. Juni 1841 vergleiche man Tiecks Brief an ihn vom 3. Juli.⁸

13. Band II, 359. Das Original dieses Briefes von Mnioch habe ich mit Holteis Fassung vergleichen können. Im ganzen darf diese als eine getreue Abschrift betrachtet werden. Mit einigen Lesarten jedoch kann ich nicht übereinstimmen. So lese ich z. B. statt "Nikolaiten" (S. 360, 7. Zeile von unten) "Nikolaitana"; statt "Anzug" (S. 361, 8. Zeile von unten) "Aufzug"; und statt "jungeren" (S. 364, 6. Zeile von unten) "innigeren". In allen diesen Fällen handelt es sich aber nur um die richtige Entzifferung von Mniochs Handschrift.

14. Band III, 223 ff. Holtei druckt 38 Briefe von Wilhelm Schlegel an Tieck ab. Doch ist es ausserst zweifelhaft, ob der erste (S. 224-225) überhaupt Wilhelm zuzuschreiben ist. Auf diese 38 Briefe folgen 16 von Friedrich und 2 von Dorothea Schlegel. Professor Henry Lüdeke-St. Gallen in der Schweiz besorgt gegenwärtig eine Ausgabe des vollständigen vorhandenen Briefwechsels zwischen Tieck und den Brüdern Schlegel, worin auch einige Briefe von Tieck an Dorothea und umgekehrt aufgenommen werden sollen. Die Originale befinden sich in der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek. Lüdekes Arbeit ist zur Zeit (März 1928) im Manuskript fertig.

15. Band IV, 44 ff. Diese drei Briefe von Solger, die alle aus dem Jahre 1811 stammen, gehören zu den ersten Solgerschen Schreiben an Tieck. Vierzig andere, aus den Jahren 1811-1819, liegen mehr oder minder vollständig in *Solgers Nachgelassenen Schriften und Briefwechsel* herausgegeben von Ludwig Tieck und Fr. von Raumer⁹ vor. Dieses Werk enthält gleichfalls dreissig mehr oder minder vollständige Briefe von Tieck an Solger.

⁷ In den *Erinnerungen an Fr. v. Uechtritz und seine Zeit*, Leipzig 1884, S. 196.

⁸ In L. H. Fischer's Werk *Aus Berlins Vergangenheit*, Berlin 1891; vgl. ferner T. Kerner, *Justinus Kerners Briefwechsel mit seinen Freunden*, Stuttgart und Leipzig 1897.

⁹ 1. Bd., Leipzig 1826, S. 214 ff.

16. Band IV, 103. Ich besitze eine Abschrift von Tiecks Antwort auf diesen Brief des amerikanischen Gelehrten George Ticknor. Tiecks Schreiben datiert aus dem Oktober des Jahres 1844.

17. Band IV, 104 ff. Holtei teilt zehn Briefe von Uechtritz an Tieck und zwei von Tieck an Uechtritz mit. Die beiden letzteren Schreiben sind auch in den *Erinnerungen an Fr. v. Uechtritz und seine Zeit* (S. 147 ff.) abgedruckt, wo auch noch vier weitere Briefe von Tieck an denselben Adressaten (vom 24. August 1827; 5. Januar 1846; 18. März 1846 und 21. März 1847) zu finden sind. Vergleicht man die Holteische Fassung der beiden von ihm mitgeteilten Tieck-Briefe mit der des Uechtritz-Bandes, so findet man nicht nur wichtige Verschiedenheiten im Text, sondern auch Unterschiede im Datum. Holtei datiert den ersten (S. 108) am 10. Dezember 1825 und den zweiten (S. 109) am 11. Februar 1827, während im Uechtritz-Bande bzw. der 12. Dezember und der 14. Februar stehen. Ich hege keinen Zweifel, dass Holtei nur die Konzepte vorlagen.

18. Band IV, 167. Brief Nr. IV, aus der Feder von Willisens stammend, gehört nicht unter Waagens Namen und müsste somit auf S. 309 eingeschaltet werden.

19. Band IV, 169 ff. Diese sechzehn Briefe von Wackenroder an Tieck sind jetzt in von der Leyens Ausgabe der *Werke und Briefe Wackenroders*¹⁰ bequemer nachzuschlagen. Von der Leyen nimmt auch Wackenroders Brief vom 1. September 1792 auf (S. 103), der Holtei noch nicht bekannt war und zum ersten Male im *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*¹¹ veröffentlicht wurde. Er muss auf S. 212 in Holteis Sammlung, zwischen Nr. X und XI, eingeschaltet werden.

20. Holteis Sammlung enthält neun Briefe von Tieck, nämlich zwei an Braniss; je einen an Immermann, Friederike Krickeberg und Reichardt; und je zwei an Uechtritz und Gustav Waagen.

21. Ausser den oben unter 5), 9), 14), 15) und 19) erwähnten Briefen von Goethe, Hebbel, den Schlegel, Solger und Wackenroder, die von Holtei nicht aufgenommen wurden aber in anderen neueren Quellen vorliegen, sind mir die mit Angabe des Verfassers,

¹⁰ 2. Bd., Jena 1910.

¹¹ 126. Bd., S. 229. Es scheint von der Leyen entgangen zu sein, dass dieser Brief bereits im *Archiv* mitgeteilt worden war.

des Datums und der Quelle folgenden anderswo gedruckten Briefe an Tieck bekannt: Arnim, 18. Februar 1809 (*Euphorion* Ergb. 15, 1923, S. 67); Burgsdorff, 15. Mai 1799 (*Deut. Literaturdenkmale* 139, S. 166); Fr. von Raumer, etwa 76 Briefe aus den Jahren 1818-1841 (*Lebenserinnerungen u. Briefwechsel v. Fr. v. Raumer*, 2 Bde., Leip. 1861; *Literar. Nachlass v. Fr. v. Raumer*, 2 Bde., Berl. 1869; siehe auch *Hamb. Nachr.* Beil. v. 11. April 1915); P. O. Runge, 4 Briefe aus den Jahren 1802-1807 (*Hinterlass. Schr. v. P. O. Runge* hrsg. v. dessen Bruder, Hamburg 1840-1841); Friedrich Tieck, 2 Briefe: 1834 u. 1846 (F. Hildebrandt, *Fr. Tieck*, Leip. 1907, S. 170 ff.); Sophie Tieck, 8. November 1804 (ebendasselbst, S. 161).¹²

Ungedruckte Briefe an Tieck befinden sich in Berlin, in Dresden und an mehreren anderen Orten.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

University of Cincinnati.

DAS WORT 'PHYSIOLOGISCH' BEI GOETHE

Wer in Goethes kritischen Schriften schärfer auf die Bedeutung des einzelnen Wortes oder Ausdrucks achtet, wird bald bemerken, daß Goethe mit einer gewissen selbstherrlichen Nachlässigkeit vorgeht, wie sie dem Grand Seigneur eigen ist. Das gilt besonders vom älteren Goethe. Jedoch verbirgt sich häufiger hinter dieser scheinbaren Nachlässigkeit ein tieferer Sinn. In dieser Hinsicht ist ein Ausspruch Goethes aus dem Jahre 1817 von Bedeutung. In *Über Kunst und Altertum* heisst es: "Die Muttersprache zugleich reinigen und bereichern ist das Geschäft der besten Köpfe; Reinigung ohne Bereicherung erweist sich öfters geistlos: denn es ist nichts bequemer, als vom Inhalt absehen und auf den Ausdruck

¹² Es ist noch nachzutragen, dass der am 21. VIII 36 datierte Brief von Hallwachs (Holtei I, 300) durch Tiecks Brief vom 30. VIII (*Archiv f. hess. Gesch. u. Altertumskunde*, N. F. 11 (1916), 282) beantwortet wurde. Auch mache ich auf vier weitere Briefe an Tieck aufmerksam: von Dorothea Schlegel, Wien, 18. IV 29 (F. Deibel, *Palästra* 40, 1906); 2 von Holtei, 1839 (Holtei, *Briefe aus und nach Grafenort*, Altona 1841); und von Öhlenschläger, undatiert (Sergel, *Ö. in s. persönl. Beziehungen zu Goethe, Tieck und Hebbel*, Rostock 1907, S. 66).

passen. Der geistreiche Mensch knetet seinen Wortstoff, ohne sich zu bekummern, aus was für Elementen er bestehe; der geistlose hat gut *rein* sprechen, da er nichts zu sagen hat. Wie sollte er fühlen, welches kummerliche Surrogat er an der Stelle eines bedeutenden Wortes gelten laßt, da ihm jenes Wort nie lebendig war, weil er nichts dabei dachte." (J. A. 37, 95.) Dieser Ausspruch ist besonders bei Goethes Gebrauch von Fremdwörtern zu beachten.

Bei der Durchsicht der in Spingarns *Goethe's Literary Essays* zusammengestellten Übersetzungen fiel mir in der kleinen Abhandlung *Über epische und dramatische Dichtung* ein Satz auf, dessen Bedeutung mir dunkel blieb und wo alle Kommentare versagten. "Die sittliche (Welt)," heißt es, "ist beiden (d. h. der epischen und der dramatischen Dichtung) ganz gemein und wird am glücklichsten in ihrer physiologischen und pathologischen Einfachheit dargestellt." (J. A. 36, 151.) Man sieht auf den ersten Blick, daßs physiologisch hier nicht in seiner gewöhnlichen Bedeutung steht. Aber was heißt dann der Satz: "Die sittliche Welt wird am glücklichsten in ihrer physiologischen Einfachheit dargestellt?"

Die Zusammenstellung von physiologisch und pathologisch, von Physiologie und Pathologie findet man bei Goethe leidlich häufig. Nun aber ist, in der technischen Bedeutung, die Physiologie die Lehre von dem gesunden Körper, die Pathologie die Lehre von Krankheiten. So sagt auch Goethe: "Wer würde eine Physiologie durch pathologische Noten zu entkräften glauben!" d. h. die Lehre vom normalen, naturgemäßen Körper läßt sich nicht durch Hinweise auf krankhafte Erscheinungen entkräften. (*Diderots Versuch über die Malerei*, J. A. 33, 219.) In derselben Abhandlung sagt Goethe, daßs der Physiolog eine abnorme Gestalt nicht gebrauchen kann, "denn sie stellt die menschliche Gestalt nicht im Durchschnitt dar" (211). Er bestreitet so die Berechtigung von Diderots Neigung, Natur und Kunst zu amalgamieren: "Er verlangt eigentlich vom Künstler, daßs er für Physiologie und Pathologie arbeiten solle, eine Aufgabe, die das Genie wohl schwerlich übernehmen würde" (211). In der Farbenlehre teilt Goethe die subjektiven Farbenempfindungen in physiologische und pathologische: jene sind dem gesunden, diese dem kranken Auge eigen (Weimarer Ausgabe, II, 1, S. 2). In den *Annalen für das Jahr 1811* heißt es: "Eine Wissenschaft ist, wie jede menschliche Anstalt und Einrichtung, eine ungeheure Kontignation von Wahrem und Falschem, von

Freiwilligem und Notwendigem, von Gesundem und Krankhaftem; alles, was wir tagtäglich gewahr werden, dürfen wir am Ende doch nur als Symptome ansehen, die, wenn wir uns wahrhaft ausbilden wollen, auf ihre physiologischen und pathologischen Prinzipie zurückzuführen sind" (J. A. 30, 261). Hier bedeutet physiologisch gesund, normal, naturgemäß. Man beachte die parallele Wortstellung: gesund—krank, wahr—falsch, physiologisch—pathologisch. Wie bildhaft konkret ist das ungewöhnliche Fremdwort Kontignation, wenn man es in seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung erfährt: ein Miteinander- oder Zusammenbauen. Ganz so gebraucht Goethe das Wort physiologisch! In den *Schriften zur Botanik* empfiehlt Goethe, damit der guten Sache nicht geschadet werde, daß man "von der eigentlichen, gesunden, physiologischen reinen Metamorphose" ausgehe. Und nur wenige Zeilen weiter heißt es: "Im Pflanzenreiche nennt man . . . das Normale in seiner Vollständigkeit mit Recht ein Gesundes, ein physiologisch Reines" (J. A. 39, 338). So definiert hier Goethe selber: das Normale in seiner Vollständigkeit ist das Gesunde, ist das physiologisch Reine. In dieser selben Bedeutung gebraucht er auch das Wort physiolog oder physiologisch von der geistigen oder der sittlichen Welt. Auch da ist das Normale, das Gesunde, das Naturgemäße das Physiologische. An Johanna Schopenhauers Roman *Gabriele* lobt er: "Einsichtige Anthropologie, sittliche physiologische Ansichten, sogar durch Familien und Generationen durchgeführt" (J. A. 37, 226). Hier kann physiolog nur der gesunden, normalen Natur gemäß bedeuten. Von hier aus fällt auch ein kleines Streiflicht auf den berühmten Ausspruch über die Romantik: "Das Klassische nenne ich das Gesunde, und das Romantische das Kranke" (Zu Eckermann, d. 2. April 1829). Klassisch ist, was der ewigen Norm entspricht: romantisch, was davon abweicht. Für die von Spingarn herausgegebene Übersetzung schlug ich für physiologisch das englische Wort *normal* vor. Goethe aber gebraucht das Wort physiologisch, weil normal oder gesund ihm nur ein kümmerliches Surrogat ist. In physiologisch klingt Goethes Anschauung von der Natur mit als der gewaltigen schöpferischen Macht, die ewig auf die gesunde Norm und deren Erhaltung drängt. So wird die Bedeutung und der Gebrauch des Wortes physiologisch in dem Anfangs zitierten Satze klar.

FRIEDRICH BRUNS.

University of Wisconsin.

A NOTE ON *HERNANI*, IV, 1

Don Carlos argues that he will be elected emperor, for

Ce Corneille Agrippa pourtant en sait bien long!
 Dans l'océan céleste il a vu treize étoiles
 Vers la mienne du Nord venir à pleines voiles.
 J'aurai l'empire, allons!

Why thirteen stars? As there were only seven electors when Charles was chosen and as, subsequently, there were never more than nine, the number is large, even in the mouth of a candidate. Several other numbers would, moreover, have been as satisfactory as *treize*, so far as meter is concerned. It is not improbable that Hugo, who had made much use of the Bible in *Cromwell* (cf. l'abbé Grillet, *La Bible dans Victor Hugo*, Lyons, E. Vitte, 1910) and makes obvious reference in the last two acts of *Hernani* to the stories of Cain and Belshazzar, was thinking of the thirteen heavenly bodies that did obeissance to Joseph (Genesis, xxxvii, 9) and thus predicted his elevation to power in Egypt:

Vidi per somnium, quasi solem, et lunam, et stellas undecim adorare me.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

THE FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATOR OF *WERTHER*—
 A CORRECTION

Mr. William A. Speck has kindly called my attention to his article, "Revealing More Secrets of the Sorrowful Werther," *International Book Review*, May, 1926, where for the first time he showed conclusively Graves's authorship of the 1779 translation of *Werther*. I regret very much that, unaware of Mr. Speck's prior claim to the point, I went over practically the same ground in my article, "The First English Translator of *Werther*," *M. L. N.* XLIII, 36-38 (January, 1928). My contribution now reduces itself to pointing out Graves's authorship of the lines *Werther to Charlotte* and *On Suicide*. Mr. Speck announced at the same time his discovery of the authorship of the *Letters to Charlotte*.

The Rice Institute.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

THREE IRREGULAR PORTUGUESE (AND GALICIAN)
IMPERFECTS

In addition to *ser*, there are three Portuguese (and Galician) imperfects which do not have the usual endings: *ia*, *ias*, etc. They are *tinha*, *vinha*, and *punha* (Galician *tiña*, *viña*, and *puña*). The accent has apparently receded to the radical vowel, the *n* has been palatalized, and the radical vowel has closed. Diez,¹ with his characteristic penchant for a teleological explanation, supposes that *tenía* became *ténia* (written *tenha*) in order to create a yod which should keep intervocalic *n* from dropping as occurred in the infinitive *teer*, *ter*; but at the same time he admits that, except for infinitives, scarcely any other examples of an accent receding from an ending to the radical vowel can be found in Portuguese or in any other Romance language. He further supposes that *tenha* became *tinha* to distinguish this tense from the present subjunctive. Bourciez² holds the same view with regard to the recession of the accent, but says nothing about the change from *e* to *i*. He explains that, without this recession, *ponía* would have become *poía*. Similarly *tenía* would have become *téia*. On the contrary, Vicente García de Diego³ accepts this very form *teía*, from which he derives *teinha* on the assumption that Romance *-ío* and *-ía* became *-inho* and *-inha*. But the only form he gives to support this epenthetic palatalized nasal is the Galician (and Old Portuguese) imperfect of *ir*: *iba* > *ia* > *iña*.⁴ In the first place, *iña* can be explained as resulting from analogy with *viña*, both words being closely related in use and meaning⁵; and in the second place, how about all the many other cases of Romance *-ío* and *-ía*; e. g., *fio* < *filu*, *sadia* < *sanativa*? Thus, the theory of Diez and Bourciez explains neither the closing of the vowel nor the development of the palatalized nasal, while the theory of García de Diego has the advantage

¹ Friedrich Diez, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, 5th ed., Bonn, 1882, p. 544.

² E. Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane*, Paris, 1910, p. 438.

³ Vicente García de Diego, *Elementos de gramática histórica gallega*, Burgos (no date), p. 123.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁵ Cf. Jules Cornu, *Portugiesische Sprache*, in Gröber's *Grundriss*, 2d ed., Strassburg, 1904-6, I, 1030, 1037.

of explaining the closing of the vowel (for pretonic *e* followed by *i* becomes *i*), but does not explain the development of the palatalized nasal. A theory must be sought which will explain both phenomena.

At the outset, several explanations that may suggest themselves must be disposed of. First, two forms of metaphony: *tenía* > *teína*, and *tenía* > *téina*. The former could not be paralleled anywhere in Portuguese, as in such cases as *rabia* > *raiva* we are dealing with a yod and not with an accented *i*. The latter would lead us nowhere, as we should still have to explain the change from *e* to *i* under the accent. And, lastly, *tenía* > *teniá* or *teniê* as in some verbs in Old Spanish.⁶ This shifting of the accent to the strong vowel to avoid the hiatus, followed by a later recession, might solve the whole problem, but such a shifting never took place in Portuguese.⁷

In expounding the present theory for the development of these forms, we shall begin with the assumption *tenebam* > *tenea* > *tenía* as generally presented.⁸

In French and Portuguese *n* and *m* in certain positions nasalize the preceding vowel. But in Portuguese we have a phenomenon which does not appear in French, viz., *n* and *m* nasalizing the vowel that follows them. We have, for example, the following developments: *nídu* > *niú* > *não* > *ninho*; *mêa* > *mia* > *mãa* > *minha*; *mihĩ* > *mĩ* > *mim*. Now in *tenía* the *n* worked both ways. It nasalized both the preceding vowel and the following vowel, giving *tênĩa*. Intervocalic *n* dropped at an early date, and thus we arrive at *têĩa*.⁹ At a somewhat later date, a nasalized

⁶ Cf. R. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual de gramática histórica española*, Madrid, 1918, p. 245; and J. D. M. Ford, *Old Spanish Readings*, Boston, 1911, p. 120.

⁷ Cf. Cornu, *op. cit.*, p. 1023; and F. Hanssen, *Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana*, Halle, 1913, p. 106. This is, furthermore, confirmed by the fact that unaccented radical vowels never show the presence of a yod in the imperfect as they do in the first and second persons plural of the present subjunctive, and in Old Spanish in the imperfect indicative (cf. Hanssen, *loc. cit.*).

⁸ Cf. Menéndez Pidal, *op. cit.*, p. 244 and p. 53; Hanssen, *op. cit.*, p. 105; Adolf Zauner, *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin, 1914, I, 146; and W. Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, Paris, 1895, II, 326.

⁹ Such a double nasalization is present in the modern form *põem* (3d plu. pres. ind.), although it is here produced by two different *n*'s.

vowel followed by another vowel generally lost its nasalization, except nasalized *i* followed by *a* or *o*, where the nasalization developed into *nh* after the *i*; e. g., *luna* > *lūna* > *lũa* > *lua*; *corona* > *corōna* > *corōa* > *corôa*; but *vinu* > *vīno* > *vīo* > *vinho*; **cocina* > *cozīna* > *cozīa* > *cozinha*; *mīa* > *mua* > *mīa* > *minha*. Thus, in *līa* the nasalization of *ē* drops and *īa* becomes *inha*, giving the form *teinha*. Meyer-Lübke may have a like theory in mind, but he offers no analysis, merely referring to *cenizas* > *cēizas* > *cinzas* as a similar development.¹⁰ The quite common Old Portuguese forms *vīr* and *vinr* < *venire*, and *vīdo* and *viindo* < **venitu* are interesting additional examples of a regressive and progressive nasalization produced by one and the same *n*.¹¹ But in these cases, instead of *nh*, we have a simple nasalization of the second *i* because the syllable is checked. In the modern infinitive the nasalization has entirely disappeared: *vir*, while in the modern past participle the progressive nasalization is retained: *vindo*. Progressive nasalization also explains *fenuclu* > *funcho* better than a shifting accent¹² or an epenthetic *n*,¹³ as follows: *fenuclu* > *fēnūclo* > *fēūclo* > *funcho* > *funcho*. But to return to *teinha*: pretonic *e* followed by *i* becomes *i* giving the form *tūinha*.¹⁴ The two *i*'s are then contracted into one, giving *linha*, the modern form.

Venia has developed in the same way, as follows: *venia* > *vēnīa* > *vēia* > *veinha* > *vinha* > *vinha*. *Ponia* develops as follows: *ponia* > *pōnīa* > *pōia* > *poinha*. Pretonic *o* followed by *i* becomes *u*, giving the form *puinha*.¹⁵ The *i* is then absorbed by the *u*, giving *punha*, the modern form.¹⁶

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, II, 326, and I, 406, 334.

¹¹ This explanation of the development of *vindo* is given in Hills, Ford and Coutinho, *A Portuguese Grammar*, New York, 1925, p. 202.

¹² Cf. Friedrich Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 5th ed., Bonn, 1887, p. 140.

¹³ Cf. Gustav Gröbe, "Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter," in *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1883-1908, II, 284.

¹⁴ Either by assimilation or by the metaphonic influence of the following *i*. Furthermore, the change of pretonic *e* to *i* is quite a common phenomenon, independent of the vowel that follows, cf. J. J. Nunes, *Chrestomathia archaica*, Lisbon, 1921 (2d ed.), *Introdução*, p. xxxix, Obs. i.

¹⁵ Compare: *rōi* > *ruim*; *coido* > *cuido*.

¹⁶ Compare Old Portuguese *chuiva* > *chuva*; Old Portuguese *luito* > *luto*; and *cuido* > popular *cudo*. Compare also *funcho* > *funcho*.

The modern forms *tinha*, *vinha*, and *punha* are thus attained without the arbitrary and unsubstantiated assumptions of a recessive accent or an epenthetic palatalized nasal.

EDWIN B. WILLIAMS.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE VALKYRIE EPISODE IN THE *NJALS SAGA*

On Good Friday 1014 there took place the famous battle of Clontarf, fought between the Irish king Brian Boromhe and his allies on the one hand and the Scandinavian Vikings of Ireland and the Western Isles on the other. The events of that battle are related, not only by the Irish chroniclers, but also in the Icelandic *Njáls Saga*.¹ After reporting the fall of Brian as well as that of his slayer, the sagaman mentions a number of omens and visions foreboding the battle or announcing it, while it was in progress, to people living many hundred miles away from the battlefield and from Ireland. It is one of these visions which will hold our attention on the following pages. The text reads as follows in English translation:

On Good Friday that event happened in Caithness that a man whose name was Daurrud went out. He saw folk riding twelve together to a bower, and there they were all lost to his sight. He went to that bower and looked in through a window slit that was in it, and saw that there were women inside, and they had set up a loom. Men's heads were the weights, but men's entrails were the warp and weft, a sword was the shuttle, and the reels were arrows. During the work they were singing a weird song referring to the impending battle.² Then they plucked down the woof and tore it asunder, and each kept what she had hold of. Now Daurrud goes away from the slit, and home; but they got on their steeds and rode six to the south, and the other six to the north. A like event befell Brand Gneisti's son in the Faroe Isles.

¹ *Brennu-Njáls saga*, herausgg. v. F. Jónsson, Halle, 1908, p. 412 ff.; for a good English translation cf. G. W. Dasent, *The Story of Burnt Njal*, Edinburgh, 1861, p. 338 ff.

² Cf. *Eddica Minora*, ed. A. Heusler u. W. Ranisch, Dortmund, 1903, No. x; for other bibliographical data cf. P. Herrmann, *Die Heldensagen des Sawo Grammaticus*, Leipzig, 1922, p. 118.

A vision in much the same style is found in the *Sturlunga Saga*.³

In the winter following the battle of Viðines (1208) an Icelandic man in a dream saw himself entering a large house, where he beheld two women covered with gore and rowing in a lake of blood while singing an equally weird song.

Both visions have repeatedly been quoted as welcome material of bearing on the Teutonic valkyries and their rôle in the religious belief of the Scandinavian North.⁴ Such a procedure is however not without hazards, as I hope to show with the help of Irish texts. For it is to be noted that precisely this type of vision recurs in Irish documents.

Before the battle of Moylena (put in the second century of our era by the Irish synchronists), three repulsive-looking witch-hags with blue beards appeared before the armies, hoarsely shrieking victory for Conn the Hundred Fighter and defeat and death for his rival, King Eoghan.⁵ In the fourteenth century, the clan Brian Roe, when marching to their destruction at the impending battle of Doolin (1317), saw in the middle of a ford a hideous-looking gigantic hag "with grey dishevelled hair, blood-draggled, and with sharp-boned arms and fingers crook'd and spare, dabbling and washing in the ford, where mid-leg deep she stood beside a heap of heads and limbs that swam in oozing blood." Asked who she was, she answered in a loud, croaking voice that she was the Washer of the Ford, and that the bloody human remains she was washing were their own heads and limbs which would be lopped off and mangled in the coming battle. Then she vanished before the terrified eyes of the soldiers.⁶

There can be little doubt that the two groups of visions, the Norse and the Irish, belong to essentially the same type. Further, in both countries, Iceland as well as Ireland, the accounts of the

³ *Sturlunga Saga*, ed. Gudbrand Vigfusson, Oxford, 1878, vii, 28. Cf. also Herrmann, *op. et loc. cit.*

⁴ W. Golther in *Abh. d. Münchener Akademie d. Wissensch., philos.-philol. Kl.*, XVIII (1890), p. 429 f.; G. Neckel, Walhall, Dortmund, 1913, p. 80 f.; Dasent, *op. cit.*, I, p. xcvi. From Golther's remarks it is clear, however, that he had his misgivings about the identification of the hags of the two visions with the valkyries.

⁵ E. O'Curry, *The Battle of Magh Leana*, Dublin, 1855, p. 119, 121.

⁶ P. W. Joyce, *A Social History of Ancient Ireland*, London, 1903, I, 269.

visions were written down a considerable time after the historical event to which they were attached. The question of the historical priority of the two groups is then not easy to settle. It is safe to assert, however, that neither group as represented by extant documents can possibly be regarded as the *direct* source of the other. Let us next enquire into the traditional character of these figures, that is, into their connexion, if there be such, with Celtic and Teutonic religious belief. The Irish hag is a well-known figure in Celtic mythology and folklore,⁷ and the witch of the battle of Doolin is no other than Badb or Mórrigan, the Irish war-fury, who appears also in the purely Irish accounts of the battle of Clontarf.⁸ The three witches of the battle of Moylena are the three Irish war-goddesses Ana, Badb, and Macha, whose mast-food, in an ancient glossary, is said to be the heads of the men slain in battle.⁹ On the other hand, no such divinities are known in the ancient Teutonic religion, which lacked a goddess of the type of the Roman Bellona and the Irish Mórrigan. The only figures which in any way resemble these are the Valkyries,¹⁰ all of them, however, vastly more impersonal and altogether lacking the plasticity of the Celtic Mórrigan and her numerous descendants, the "hags of slaughter," as they are called in Gaelic folk-tales. Under these circumstances it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the two Icelandic visions which formed the starting-point of this enquiry are not Teutonic at all but of Celtic origin, having drifted north, to Iceland, with a good deal of other Celtic legendary material.

The problem does not end there, however. The sinister figures of the *Njáls Saga* are seen weaving, a feature not found in the Irish parallels. It is clear that this activity of the war witches is connected with the Teutonic belief in the Norns and the conception of their spinning or weaving the fate of man.¹¹

⁷ I have dwelt more at length on this curious type in my recent book *Balor with the Evil Eye*, New York, 1927, p. 132 ff.

⁸ Joyce, I, 266; cf. also J. H. Todd, *The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill*, London, 1867, p. 174 f.

⁹ W. Stokes, *Three Irish Glossaries*, London, 1862, p. xxxv.

¹⁰ G. Neckel, *op. cit.*, p. 74 ff.

¹¹ Cf. the etymology of O. E. *wyrd*, O. H. G. *wurt* = fate, death, from the same root as Lat. *vertere*, O. H. G. *wirt*, *wirtel* = spindle; cf. R. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt*, München, 1910, p. 241; H. Güntert,

Lastly, the Celtic texts say nothing about the witches rushing to the scene of the disaster, as at least six of them do in the *Njáls Saga*. There exists, however, one Teutonic parallel, from a considerably later period, it is true, which goes far to show that this particular trait is likewise a Norse addition to a more rudimentary legend of Celtic provenance.

When the powder magazine at Malines, in Belgium, was blown up by a stroke of lightning in 1546, the city was partly destroyed and many of the inhabitants were killed. Soon after, some merchants coming from Friesland reported that they had seen a large swarm of devils flying in the air toward Malines. One of them was heard shouting to another: "Take the mill (in front of which the merchants were standing) along." But the second answered: "I can't; I have to go to Malines. Short-tail (another devil) is to take care of the mill." And the mill was indeed destroyed that same night.¹²

To sum up: the visions foreboding impending disaster, found in the *Njáls* and *Sturlunga Sagas*, are essentially of Celtic, i. e. probably Irish, origin. The episode of the *Sturlunga Saga* is almost purely Celtic in structure and content.¹³ The vision of the *Njáls Saga*, embodying, no doubt, eleventh century material, has skilfully fused the Irish vision tale of the Mórrígan and her weird sisters with features of Scandinavian belief in the Norns and added the Teutonic, perhaps even christian, conception of the demons rushing to a scene of disaster and overheard by a mortal.¹⁴ Neither of the two visions can therefore be safely utilised for an enquiry into the Teutonic legends connected with the valkyries, and their origin.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

Kalypso, Halle, 1919, p. 253; further the O. E. word *freoðunwebbe* and the Dutch *oorlog* = war.

¹² J. W. Wolf, *Niederländische Sagen*, Leipzig, 1843, p. 278.

¹³ As Golther pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 430), the song of the war witches of the *Njáls Saga* exercised a certain influence upon the verses quoted in the *Sturlunga Saga*.

¹⁴ On the "Overhearing motif" cf. Bolte-Polívka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, II (1915), p. 481 f.; Tawney-Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, London, 1924 ff., I, 48; II, 107, 219 f.; III, 48, 60 ff.; A. Wesselski, *Märchen des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1925, p. 205 f.

REVIEWS

Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, Richard FitzRalph's Sermon: 'Defensio Curatorum,' and Methodius: 'þe Bygynnyng of the World and þe Ende of Worldes.' By John Trevisa. Edited by AARON JENKINS PERRY. Oxford University Press for the E. E. T. S., Orig. Ser. 167. 1925 (for 1924). Pp. clvi + 116.

A Stanzaic Life of Christ . . . from MS. Harley 3909. Edited by FRANCES A. FOSTER. Oxford University Press for the E. E. T. S., Orig. Ser. 166. 1926 (for 1924). Pp. xliii + 456.

The History of the Translation of the Blessed Martyrs of Christ Marcellinus and Peter. The English Version by BARRETT WENDELL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. 115.

This edition of three hitherto unpublished pieces of translation by John Trevisa is very welcome. We have been able to estimate his quality as a translator from his version of Higden's *Polychronicon*, but we have had no means of knowing whether his prose was equally good in other kinds of work. The *Dialogue between a Knight and a Clerk* sets at rest any doubt on that score. Of course much of the merit of this debate belongs to the Latin, which is ascribed to William of Occam; but in its English dress it is so brisk and entertaining that John Trevisa deserves more than a little praise. In spite of his precise habit of using doublets to translate single Latin words—a custom perhaps less peculiar to him than Professor Perry thinks—Trevisa wrote extremely good prose. So did various other men of his day, it being only modern pedantry to regard a style different from ours a clumsy style. Richard FitzRalph's diatribe in defence of the secular clergy as against friars, which he delivered at Avignon in 1357, suffers little from translation, as one can be sure even without knowing the original.

Aside from their interest as specimens of Trevisa's prose, both of these works have value for the history of opinion and manners. The basis of sovereignty is discussed with vigor in the *Dialogue*, the knight having the better of the argument; and in the so-called *Sermon* the charges that were current against the Franciscans in the second half of the fourteenth century are unsparingly detailed. That Trevisa should have approved the views set forth in both cases, though one work had been written by a Franciscan leader

and the other by a bishop of Armagh to whom all contemporary Franciscans were an abhorrence, is of itself worth noting.

Professor Perry's edition of these valuable materials is remarkable for the good intentions and the industry he has shown rather than for his accomplishment. His account in the Introduction of the MSS and the early prints is painstaking, as is the still longer discussion of Trevisa's life and works. Unfortunately he shows so little power of arrangement and of compression that one finds it difficult to work through to his conclusions. A typical example is his examination of *De Re Militari*. On p. xcv, note 8, we see that the editor believes in Trevisa's authorship, yet on p. xcvi we find three cogent reasons presented against this view. The difficulty appears to be that Mr. Perry has printed all the notes he has ever taken, without going to the pains of thoroughly digesting them. The result is that much money has been wasted, and much time will be wasted by the scholars who have to use the book. One becomes impatient with such futility.

On the other hand, we must give the editor credit for the immense amount of labor he has done. His industry in examining the MSS. and all relevant records is beyond dispute. Probably, too, his texts may be trusted, though the list of *corrigenda* is rather formidable, and should have been lengthened by obvious errors on pp. 15 and 17, which he has not noted.

Miss Foster, to whom we already owe the excellent edition of the *Northern Passion*, has admirably edited this life of Christ in quatrains, composed in Chester before the end of the fourteenth century. Although the work has little merit of itself, being a mere compilation in undistinguished verse of material chiefly drawn from Higden's *Polychronicon* and the *Legenda Aurea*, it well deserves the attention of scholars because of its relationship to the *Chester Plays*, if for no other reason. Miss Foster shows conclusively that the *Nativity* and the *Purification* were based on the *Stanzaic Life* now printed, while the *Adoration* and the *Oblation of the Magi*, the *Temptation*, the *Harrowing of Hell*, and the *Ascension* seem to have had the same source. A possible influence on four other plays can also be traced. It is clear, as Miss Foster says, that the original Chester cycle "was written by a man who knew the *Stanzaic Life*." As a connection between five other plays and vernacular literature had already been noted, we now know that to a very considerable degree the authors of the cycle depended for their material on English writings instead of Latin. In other words, they took what was nearest at hand and most easily remembered.

The fact that such a use was made of the *Life* now before us lights up wonderfully its rather dreary stretches of commonplace verse. The author says (l. 9) that "a worthy wight" desired him to put into English "certain things" that he had seen in

Latin. The result is a work of more than ten thousand lines, which includes most of the stories from the Bible that a layman needed to know. As Miss Foster points out, these were the stories most often shown in sculpture and glass. Evidently, then, the simple quatrains that seem tedious to the modern reader not only furnished materials for the dramatic representation of scriptural events, but satisfied a real need by way of explaining the pictorial representations to be seen in the churches. The reader would be rewarded, furthermore, by a good deal of lore and a good many stories which have little to do with the Scriptures. Instruction could scarcely have been furnished him in a more palatable form. For conciseness, as well as accuracy of statement, Miss Foster's introduction and notes leave nothing to be desired, while her glossary is equally well done.

It is a pleasure to read and to praise, even though belatedly, Professor Wendell's translation of a work which has been too much overshadowed by another production of the same author. There is no question that Eginhard will always be chiefly remembered by his *Vita Caroli*; yet that is no reason for neglecting his altogether delightful account of the adventure by which he secured the bodies of two supposed saints in Rome, together with a miscellaneous lot of other relics less important and valuable. Eginhard's treatise has been carefully studied by Marguerite Bondonio, *La Translation des saints Marcellin et Pierre* (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études, 160, 1907). The reader who cares to know its importance as a revelation of political conditions and states of mind in the ninth century should turn to her monograph. It is sufficient to say here that Mr. Wendell was right in thinking that Eginhard's little book ought to be turned into English. Certainly no one interested in the history or literature of the ninth century can afford to be ignorant of it.

Mr. Wendell's translation is a very satisfactory one—better, it seems to me, than Teulet's careful version in French. His prose is stiffer than Eginhard's; it does not suggest very well the rhythms of the Latin; but it is pleasant in its own mannered way and keeps close to the text. We should be grateful that he had the inclination to do the translation and that he lived to complete it. We may well be grateful also that it has been issued in so beautiful a form by the Harvard University Press.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

Princeton University.

Surnames. By ERNEST WEEKLEY. Second Edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. xxii + 364 pp.

The Romance of Words. By ERNEST WEEKLEY. Fourth edition. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. xii + 255 pp.

The Knowledge of English. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1927. x + 572 pp.

The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as Taught by William Bullokar, with Word-Lists from All His Works. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistika Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 22:6) Uppsala and Leipzig, 1927. xvi + 243 pp.

On the Origin of the Gerund in English. By GEORG CH. VAN LANGENHOVE. "Phonology." (Université de Gand, Recueil de Travaux publiés par la faculté de philosophie et lettres, 56^e fascicule.) Gand and Paris, 1925. xxviii + 132 pp.

The two volumes by Weekley are apparently unchanged reprints, *Surnames* of the 1917 edition and *The Romance of Words* of the 1922. These works, though they are rather popular than scholarly in character, nevertheless have a good deal of interest and value for the serious student of English linguistic history.

The scope of *The Knowledge of English* is clearly suggested by its title. The chief purpose of this work is, however, not to impart knowledge for its own sake; "increase of effectiveness in the use of the English Language" is made at least co-ordinate with "increase of knowledge." Though this volume presents in combination many of the elements usually found singly in manuals of grammar and rhetoric, handbooks on pronunciation, and treatises on style, as well as in histories of the language, it is at the furthest remove from an encyclopedic compendium of authoritative pronouncements upon particular questions. Its plan is to provide the intelligent user of English with such a body of fact and such discussion of general principles as will equip him to exercise discriminately his own judgement. This competent presentation of underlying principles and the insistence upon individual responsibility give the work its distinctive value. Its chief blemish lies in occasional inexplicable lapses in statements of fact—puzzling contradictions or statements so broadly and loosely made as to be misleading. But despite these surprising lapses, *The Knowledge of English* goes far toward attaining its chief end, that of "making clear at least a reasonable attitude of mind towards the many and variegated

problems presented by the English language in its practical applications." The publishers have done admirably by the volume.

Zachrisson's study is in the first instance a critical examination of all the works of the Elizabethan spelling reformer, William Bullokar, in the effort to deduce information concerning the pronunciation of English which was current in London during the latter half of the sixteenth century. Since Bullokar's chief aim was only the amendment of the conventional orthography, largely by means of diacritical signs, his system lacks precision and is by no means free from ambiguity. Moreover a system such as his, even if the user of it is a competent observer and careful and consistent transcriber—as Bullokar apparently was not—is peculiarly susceptible to mistake in passing through the hands of the printer. As a consequence, Bullokar's works, important as they are because of their extent, demand such a critical examination as Zachrisson has given them. The presentation of Bullokar material includes not only a discussion of Bullokar's symbols and the sounds represented by them together with rime-lists and word-lists extending over almost fifty pages, but also a collation of Plessow's reprints (*Palæstra* LII) with the originals, a facsimile reproduction of a page in Bullokar's *Æsop's Fables*, an examination of especial elements of his vocabulary, and an attempt—on slight evidence, to be sure—to arrive at the provenience of Bullokar's family.

The attempt to determine Bullokar's probable pronunciation becomes practically a review of the whole subject of the sounds of early standard English in the light of even the most recent studies in this field. Such a review at Zachrisson's hands is of great value. It results in a redefinition, with some modification in particulars, of Zachrisson's own position. His most significant change is from insistence upon uniformity to a conviction that "not only the isolated words but also *one distinct sound* was often pronounced differently by different speakers" (p. ix). These differences Zachrisson considers "not, in the first place, due to dialectal importations but principally to the existence in early Standard speech of advanced or colloquial forms of pronunciation, by the side of learned or more old-fashioned ones" (p. x). One would expect both causes to be vigorously operative in sixteenth century London speech. Zachrisson reaffirms his distrust of the early orthoepists and his reliance upon the evidence of occasional spellings. This attitude has led him to make a rigid paleographical examination of the most important early Modern English documents of colloquial character; as a result, he presents a number of significant corrected readings, which constitute not the least valuable part of his study.

It is fortunate for students of the history of early Modern English sounds that Zachrisson was unable to carry out his inten-

tion of publishing his study of Bullokar in 1913; the work as then planned could not have had the value and service of the present one. It is unfortunate that numerous and at least occasionally serious typographical errors appear.

The aim of van Langenhove's study is "to treat as fully as possible of the morphological development of the verbal noun, present participle, and infinitive up till the close of the Middle English period" (p. x) in the attempt to solve the problem of the origin of the English gerund by an approach other than that through syntactic studies. His conclusion (pp. 131-32) is that the gerund is only a form of the infinitive, and that it "owes its existence to a double confusion: (a) of the inflected and uninflected infinitives, as its form is the inflected one without the preposition *to*; (b) of this infinitive in *-n* and the verbal noun in *-ing*, both words having in the spoken language the same form, often the same meaning, sometimes the same construction." The statement that the form of the gerund is that of the inflected infinitive without *to* is apparently based (pp. 126 ff.) on a small number of such forms as "to wetynge," "to menyng," "to doinge" which are found in some Middle English texts. The ending *-yng*, *-ing* (ɪŋ) is given a possible double origin (p. 126): first, after the original suffix *-enne* of the inflected infinitive had been reduced to *-in* or *-en*, *-ŋ* was substituted for *-n*; second, from late Old English onward, van Langenhove states, the verbal noun ended in *-n*, so that "in the spoken language the infinitives in *-n* and the verbal noun in *-n* were no longer distinguished the one from the other." It is assumed, apparently, that when the infinitive and the verbal noun had both come to have a common form terminating in *-n*, this coalescence caused the extension to the infinitive of the termination *-ng*(-ŋ) which was normal to the verbal noun. The further argument seems to be (pp. 127-28) that since the inflected, prepositional infinitive had acquired the suffix *-ing* (-ɪŋ), the simple infinitive must also have acquired this same suffix, because both the inflected and the simple infinitive had become confounded in early Middle English. The gerund would thus be only a somewhat specialized development of the infinitive which had acquired the suffix *-ing* (-ɪŋ).

In my judgment the development thus urged is at best only a possibility—certainly not a demonstrated actuality. The occasional "to —ng" forms, on which apparently the argument is based, may be in part verbal nouns, in part learned imitations of Latin syntax. In the texts in which these forms occur, the infinitive ends normally not in *-n* but in *-e*, and if the scribal usage was as conventional and traditional as van Langenhove insists that it was, *-n* must have fallen away so early that the suggested substitution of *-ng* (-ŋ) is altogether unlikely. Finally, if there

had ever been complete confusion and coalescence of forms, the later actual differentiation would demand explanation.

A brief notice such as this, does not permit any review of van Langenhove's detailed presentation of the morphological development of the Old and Middle English forms which fills the greater part of this study. The entire work is marked by great industry and learning—and by almost too great ingenuity.

W. F. BRYAN.

Northwestern University.

Arthur of Britain. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1927. Pp. viii + 299.

Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. Uppsala, 1927. Pp. 95.

If the definitive history of King Arthur is ever written, it will be written by a medievalist who is both a Celticist and a Romanicist; who is expert in etymology, particularly in that difficult field, the etymology of medieval proper names; and who is versed in the ways of popular as well as literary tradition. Few men, of course, have such an equipment—if indeed any man now living can lay claim to it. And Sir Edmund Chambers, excellent medievalist though he is, rightly refuses to undertake an exhaustive study of King Arthur and the problems connected with his name. His book may with justice be described as a manual, in which a survey of the Arthurian field is presented for the guidance of University students and intelligent laymen. As such, the work merits high praise. The author is a true philologist, i. e., he is at home in his texts. He knows how to marshal in orderly ranks the evidence derived from these texts. His English is pleasant to read. These qualities make his book useful and welcome, not only to the beginner but to the trained and tried Arthurian scholar as well. For who does not profit by reading a clear-headed survey, even though it be of his own field?

But the prospective reader must not expect too much. The author does not solve, or even attempt to solve, any of the problems of Arthurian scholarship. He summarizes or presents the material contained in the source-texts. He reviews the learned hypotheses and constructions based on this material. And he tells us where he stands on each controversial point. Beyond this he does not go. Apart from a few distinctly minor matters, the book gives us neither new facts nor new hypotheses. To put it in the scientific jargon of the day, the book does not "extend the boundaries of human

knowledge." Moreover, Sir Edmund is not free from human frailty. He sometimes makes mistakes, and writes with something of a bias. His mistakes and his bias have a certain relationship. That he is no Celticist is sufficiently obvious from his repeated use of *Mabinogi* as a plural (pp. 67, 68, 69, 155, 205), and from his reference to the Cornish *aruthr* (p. 170). It is natural enough, then, that he should be sceptical about the extent and importance of the Celtic sources of Arthurian romance. This bias manifests itself, on the one hand, in a highly critical attitude toward any Celtic parallels that have been brought forward, and, on the other hand, in an uncritical acceptance of the thesis that "the parallels are generally only for isolated features, and do not extend to the linking together of these in complete stories" (p. 153). To this dictum he allows only two exceptions: the Tristan story and the Beheading Game. One might expect to find the *Charrele* of Chrétien given as a third exception, in view of the well-known parallels and Chrétien's own statement about his source of information, but no; Sir Edmund tells us that "it is not necessary to assume that he [Chrétien] took the whole of any story from a single source" (p. 145). Sir Edmund's faith in the invariable mendacity of the medieval writer may be magnificent, but it is not science. Again, the author is not without prejudice (and thus not without cause) against mythological interpretations; thus, he insists on the historicity of Arthur, and derives Arthur's name from the Latin *Artorius*. And yet, curiously enough, he is not willing to accept as the historical prototype of Arthur the only British Artorius of whom we have any record, viz., the Roman general Lucius Artorius Castus. With robust faith, he clings to a fifth or sixth century Artorius for whose historicity we have not a scrap of evidence!

There are not a few other things in the book which call for adverse criticism, but I will confine myself to the points which follow. In discussing Marie and Chrétien, the author remarks (p. 142), "a tradition of conscious literature has begun." The remark may represent nothing more than a momentary lapse, but if it is the author's weighed and considered opinion I must protest. It is dangerous to say that any piece of literature is "unconscious," and certainly in the Middle Ages literary consciousness was in existence long before Marie and Chrétien. Where can be found a work of art more "conscious" and sophisticated than *Beowulf*? And on the Continent literary consciousness was hardly much slower in awakening than in England. On p. 148, the author tells us that "names do not always pass orally in accordance with strict phonetic laws." Whether true or not, this is dangerous doctrine in practice; moreover, so far as the romances are concerned, the variant forms of the proper names are for the most part due to scribal liberties, not to modifications in the

course of oral transmission. As an example may serve the name of Arthur's foster-father, which Sir Edmund records as Entor (p. 158), but which was properly and originally Arthur, as Sommer and Bruce have pointed out. In a number of passages (see pp. 87, 151, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 208, 210, 211, 219, 227) the author makes use of the terms *philology*, *philologist*, *philological* when he means *etymology*, *etymologist*, *etymological*. Against this mistreatment of the English language I can only record my earnest protest. Occasionally, it is true, Sir Edmund uses the right word. Thus, on p. 181 he says, "the bear etymology for Arthur is very doubtful." We must be grateful that he did not say "the bear philology." On p. 181 the author, who is discussing the Germanic invasion of Britain, speaks of a wave of Anglo-Saxons who pushed up the Thames valley. But we have no evidence that the Angles invaded Britain by way of the Thames. The wave in question was undoubtedly a wave of Saxons, not of Angles and Saxons. On p. 198 we are told that "it is very doubtful whether the Saxons were at any time far-flung pirates like the Danes who followed them. Their transmarine raids seem to have been limited to the *litus saxonicum*." But there was a Gallic as well as a British *litus*, and the Saxon forays seem to have extended as far as the mouth of the Loire, although they did not reach the Mediterranean as the Danes did later. Gildas himself testifies that the Saxons reached the western ocean (as Sir Edmund notes on p. 199), and it is altogether likely that they reached it by sea rather than by land. On the whole, the description "far-flung pirates" is apt enough for the Saxons of the fifth century at least. On p. 217 the author repeats the old explanation of the Round Table based partly on Posidonius; he seems unacquainted with Mrs. Loomis's admirable study of the iconography of the Round Table (*PMLA*. xli, 771 ff.). In the Bibliography I miss also Matter's fat volume printed in the *Anglistische Forschungen*, and Hulbert's Gawain articles in *Modern Philology*.

Professor Zachrisson's monograph deals chiefly with the survival of the British population in the areas overrun by the English in the fifth and sixth centuries. His conclusions are hardly different from the views current nowadays on the subject: he holds that on the whole the British population was not so much exterminated or expelled as absorbed by the English invaders. The proportionate number of those exterminated or expelled decreases, of those absorbed increases, as one proceeds from east to west. I am in agreement with these conclusions. I must disagree, however, in the interpretation of the linguistic evidence which he presents. The total absence or extreme rarity of place-names of Celtic or Romano-Celtic origin in any given region certainly indicates that the invaders exterminated or expelled the natives pretty thoroughly. But the survival of such place-names does not

prove that there was any mixture of races in the region of survival. It proves rather that here the English occupation was gradual or peaceful; the conquerors had time and opportunity to learn some of the names that went with the countryside. In the United States the Red Indians were not to any appreciable extent absorbed into the population, but Indian place-names survive by the thousand to the present day; similarly in Australia. I believe that the British population was to a large extent absorbed by the English invaders, but I do not base this belief on the survival of Celtic place-names.

KEMP MALONE.

Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Âge I. Le Théâtre religieux. Par GUSTAVE COHEN. Les Editions Rieder, Paris (Mars 1928). Pp. 80. 59 planches et héliogravures. Prix: 16 fr. 50.

Petit volume élégant de corps et d'âme. Mr. C. y trace l'évolution du drame religieux au moyen âge. Dans une courte introduction il rattache le fait dramatique au fait social et religieux. "Toute religion est par elle-même génératrice de drame" Source du drame le fait religieux en est resté le support pendant de longues générations. Ainsi s'explique la continuité méconnue mais certaine de l'évolution dramatique depuis le XI^{me} siècle jusqu'à nos jours. Alexandre Hardy est le locataire des Confrères de la Passion. Corneille avec *Polyeucte* reprend sur les lèvres du moyen âge la phrase religieuse interrompue. Et, surtout, le succès de la Tragi-Comédie au 17^{me} siècle est significatif de la survie du théâtre religieux du moyen âge (liberté et diversité des lieux, usage de l'apparition et de la disparition, mélange du comique au pathétique, etc). Or, dit notre auteur, "... la froide tragédie de la Renaissance n'est devenue la tragédie cornélienne qu'après avoir en quelque sorte pris un bain de tragi-comédie." Heureuse formule que Lancaister ne démentira pas.

Les stages de l'évolution sont: Le drame liturgique encore engainé dans l'office divin, le drame semi-liturgique où le latin cède la place au français et où le décor s'avance hors de l'Eglise, enfin les Mystères. Le drame liturgique va en somme du 9^{me} au 12^{me} siècle¹ et le drame semi-liturgique "correspond sensiblement à la seconde moitié du 12^{me} et au 13^{me} siècle tout entier." Quant aux Mystères ils continuent la série dans le temps. A ce propos Mr. C. rappelle que les travaux récents de Bédier, Karl Christ, Grace Frank, Emile Roy, Shepard et Thomas (auxquels il faut

¹ Mais on le trouve longtemps après comme en témoignent entre autres documents les Ms. du 14^{me} siècle, Nos. 1150 et 833, de Troyes.

joindre Mr. C. lui-même pour sa trouvaille des *Moralités du 14^{me} siècle du ms. de Chantilly*) ont fait enfin justice de la prétendue carence du théâtre religieux au 14^{me} siècle.

A la fin de son exposé l'auteur utilise sobrement sa découverte du *Livre de conduite du régisseur et compte des dépenses pour le Mystère de la Passion joué à Mons en 1501*. Ce très précieux document nous renseigne sur les entrées en jeu des personnages, les costumes, la mimique, la construction de la scène et la plantation des décors. Les effets obtenus alors par les trucs et "secrets" de la mise en scène sont vraiment étonnants. Qui sait si ce n'est pas dans le théâtre du moyen âge (et ainsi dans le fait religieux et non dans la pression économique) qu'il faut chercher les commencements vrais de la mécanique? Dans le jeu de Mons la machinerie était "confiée à deux spécialistes de Chauny, maîtres Guillaume et Jean Delechière." Les gens de Chauny avaient, nous dit Rabelais, la réputation d'être "grands bailleurs de cynges verds." Mais on peut se demander si en fait ils n'étaient pas d'ingénieurs illusionnistes mécaniques plutôt que de simples acrobates et bonisseurs.

La conclusion de Mr C. est que le théâtre du moyen âge a tenté "une entreprise désespérée: figurer sur la place publique . . . l'oeuvre du Créateur, mais que cette entreprise a laissé des ruines encore imposantes et qu'elle était digne de l'époque qui conçut et réalisa . . . la *Divine Comédie*." Sage, juste et mélancolique hommage! Mortellement coingé entre les goûts nouveaux des Humanistes et les scrupules des Réformateurs religieux, ce théâtre devait mourir d'étouffement au 16^{me} siècle. Mais qui sait si, sans les coquebins de Coqueret et les parpaillots de Genève, il ne se fût pas repris à vivre et n'eût pas donné des fruits admirables et tardifs?

L'ouvrage de Mr C. est bellement illustré (entre autres gravures toute la série des miniatures du Ms. fr. 12536 de la Nationale). Les fines héliogravures X à XXXVIII, véritables portraits de groupes, sont infiniment plaisantes et instructives. L'impression est soignée. Le diable des coquilles typographiques a pourtant fait des siennes: page 54, ligne 20, *lamère* pour *la mère* et planche XLVI, une virgule intruse dans le titre de la gravure du haut.

En somme un bon et joli petit livre. Il ne se donne pas comme fait pour les spécialistes mais les spécialistes ne perdront rien à le lire.

LOUIS CONS.

University of Illinois.

Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance. Selections from the German Romantic Authors, 1790-1830, in English Translation. Edited by FREDERICK E. PIERCE and CARL F. SCHREIBER. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. Pp. 392. \$2.00.

The Romantic Movement in German Literature. Illustrative Texts-Prose and Verse. Selected by KARL BREUL. Cambridge: Heffer. Pp. 505. \$2.00.

At the very close of his long life, Goethe wrote in *Rezensionen und Aufsätze* as follows: "Was man auch von der Unzulänglichkeit des Übersetzers sagen mag, so ist und bleibt es doch eines der wichtigsten und würdigsten Geschäfte in dem allgemeinen Weltverkehr." The idea then is clear, and it is sound. Departments of Comparative Literature, English Branch, owe therefore a large and legitimate debt to Professors Pierce and Schreiber for their diligence. They have edited with care pivotal selections from eleven of the cardinal German Romanticists. Of the twenty-four translations, all are their own except Carlyle's rendering of Tieck's *Der Runenberg*, Longfellow's of *Das Glück von Edenhall*, and W. E. Aytoun's of *Des Sängers Fluch*. With these exceptions they have shunned the thought of doing what has already been done. Their translations reveal feeling and finesse; their prose in truth is superior to Carlyle's.

Of course, their desire to be scholarly was commendable. What they needed was a trifle more nerve. They have condensed in some instances, particularly in the case of Arnim's *Isabella von Ägypten* which is more abridged than they admit. But they should have re-paragraphed Arnim and the others. Not many Germans of Arnim's day, nor of the present either, know the exquisite art of paragraphing. There is never anywhere, under any conditions, a forgivable reason for running a single paragraph through one, two, or three pages, as the Germans sometimes do. The complete translation of Kleist's *Kätchen von Heilbronn* is a most welcome addition to *Weltliteratur*. But, to repeat, one feels a fear of choking on merely looking at the unparagraphed speeches of Theobald and his confederates.

The appendices, with their charts of romantic authors, bibliography, and suggestions for comparative readings, are suggestive and informative, though they cover but five pages. Dr. Pierce's introductory essay on the interplay between English and German Romanticism should disclose a new world to the English student who, frequently and regrettably, is a one-language investigator. It is only a pity that he had to follow such "stop" and "go" signals as were sent out from 35 West 32nd Street, New York City.

Dr. Schreiber suffered from the same source: his good work on the German and his Romanticism is too brief. It omits Lessing, though there are others of the *Zunft* who have done the same. Lessing himself was certainly not a Romanticist; but he just as certainly paved the way and built the bridges for those who were to follow: translations, the short story, philology, the Orient, Romance languages and literatures, cosmopolitanism, new religion, new Bible, elevation of the Jews, manuscripts, fragments, Shakespeare first of all, and even *Das Teutschtum*—these are a few of Lessing's fields.

In 1903, H. Spiess published (Leipzig: Freytag) *Die deutschen Romantiker. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben*. Since this admirable little text has been allowed to lapse, Professor Breul's is the best on the market; and since it is twice as large as Spiess's, it is the best without limitation or condition. And it would have been even more serviceable to the student of German had it not included so many lyrics that have already been edited again and again by Hatfield, Bruns, von Klenze, Nollen, Vos and Barba. But the prose selections could hardly be improved upon: they are of capital importance, and, in the provinces at least, hard to get. The biographical sketches, in German, are well done, though at times a trifle long. There are 97 pages of notes, in English, some of which are detailed almost to the point of intricacy, as in the case of Goethe's *Bei Betrachtung von Schillers Schadel*; some are quite brief, as when we are told to render *was nur* by "whatever."

The student, or reader, who has had no experience in the bringing out of texts of this nature is frequently hypercritical; he is sensitive. He sees a slight and obvious error and all but swoons at the display of "carelessness." It is just about impossible to edit such texts without an occasional and paltry mistake. There are a few in each of these texts, but they are evident misprints, as where Pierce and Schreiber have Tieck born in 1797 instead of 1773, and where Breul has Immermann born in 1794 instead of 1796. Both are good helpful books and should be benevolently received by those who did not work at and on them.

Since each stresses bibliography, and since each keeps away from recent investigations, with the exception of Stephan's *Rheinromantik* and Stockmann's two volumes on *Die Romantik*, a few treatises published since 1925 may be noted.

Die blaue Blume, by Cajetan Oswald, (München: Gesellschaft für christliche Kunst, 98 pages, 54 illustrations). Though not erudite, the book is exceedingly pleasing. It treats, with running comment and liberal quotations, such themes as one would readily look for in view of the publisher. And it illustrates these themes with glorious illustrations, some in color, from the works of Steinle,

Schwind, Rethel, Führich, Friedrich and their contemporaries. It is anything but a shoddy "gift" book.

Humanismus und Romantik, by H. A. Korff (Leipzig: J. J. Weber, 111 pp.). In his preface Korff says: "Nichts fällt dem Laien im allgemeinen schwerer, als in der verwirrenden Mannigfaltigkeit der Geschichte die grossen Linien zu erblicken." These lines—those between *Humanismus* and *Romantik* in the age of Goethe—Korff has drawn with great clearness. In a sense, the book is a commentary to *Faust*.

Die Romantik und die Geschichte, by Kurt Borries (Berlin: Gesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 235 pp.). Of German Romanticism, Breul says: "It was a purely literary revolt." This is a dubious contention. Borries takes a quite different stand. The last words of his treatise are: "Unser geistiges Leben in Kunst, Wissenschaft und Politik bis auf den heutigen Tag ist ohne die Romantik nicht zu denken." The book is supplied with copious notes.

Gesellschaft und Staat im Spiegel deutscher Romantik, by Jakob Baxa (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 665 pp.). Baxa asserts that we are just beginning the scientific study of Romanticism. He devotes much space to Görres, Baader, Gentz, Chancellor Hardenberg, Stein and Adam Müller. There are 132 pages of notes and an elaborate chart, somewhat after the fashion of Pierce and Schreiber, though confined to German authors.

Dichter der Romantik, by Georg Wendel (Berlin: Emil Ebering, 31 pp.). Written to refute Georg Brandes and to show that Romanticism, instead of being a thing to be overcome, is a movement or tendency to be imitated, if adequately gifted.

Rahel und Alexander von der Marwitz in ihren Briefen, by Heinrich Meisner (Stuttgart: Perthes, 311 pp.). As is always the case, throws much light on Rahel and the Romanticism she lived through. Of Marwitz, Rahel writes: "Er war der letzte, den ich über mich stellte." The letters run from June 26, 1809, to December 29, 1813. There are 16 pages of notes.

Romantik-Land, by Ludwig Benninghoff (Hamburg: Hansca-tischer Verlag, 242 pp.). The Romanticists talked much of *Natur*, *Landschaft*, *Seele*, *Sehnsucht*, *Übersinnlichkeit*, *Volk*, *Mensch*, *Mystik*, *Symbolik*, *Kunst*, and related concepts. This book is an anthology of pertinent selections on these and other themes, illustrated by works of the Romantic painters. Ph. O. Runge's *Quelle* is used to "illustrate" Kleist's *Robert Guiscard*; Rethel's *Der Bannerträger* goes with E. M. Arndt's *Deutscher Trost*. Benninghoff's idea is good, provided we believe strongly in *Gütergemeinschaft der Sinne*, are wholly patriotic, and feel that the Romanticists adopted without reservation Mörike's plea for *holdes Bescheiden* in the perpetual warfare between the material and the spiritual.

Das Buch der deutschen Romantik, by Ernst Ludwig Schellenberg (Berlin: Hugo Bermuhler, 323 pp.). This is the most lavishly illustrated book that has ever been written on the subject. It goes on the assumption that to a painter of a Madonna a symphony is a Madonna; that to a sculptor, a living actor is a statue, and the reverse. Lessing would have objected; but Lessing has less influence to-day than those who uphold the theory of the federation of the arts. Schellenberg's is an admirable book; though it says many things that have been said before, it says some things that have not been said, and that would not have been said had not the World War turned the sympathetic attention of the humiliated Germans back to the writers of a century ago. But what the German of to-day needs, in this connection, is anthologies; of general treatises he has enough. Pierce, Schreiber, and Breul should mean more to him than Wendel, Korff, and Schellenberg.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD.

West Virginia University.

The History of Harlequin. By CECIL W. BEAUMONT. London, Beaumont, 1926.

La Commedia dell'arte. By CONSTANT MIC. Paris. Pléiade, 1927.

For the last few years handsome books on Italian comedy appear on an average of one every six months or so. The two which have come most recently to my notice are of very unequal value; Mr. Palmer's *History of Harlequin* is a beautifully printed and illustrated, readable collection of more or less authentic facts and anecdotes, unevenly documented and fresh only in certain interesting details on the English harlequinade; Mr. Mic's *La Commedia dell'arte*, also beautifully printed and illustrated, is on the whole the most soundly based and the most authoritative treatment of the subject that has yet appeared.

Mr. Mic, who as C. Miclachevsky, has published two editions in Russian of this work (1914 and 1917), began his study of the *commedia dell'arte* with the production of some plays at the old theater in Leningrad before the war; since then he has spent a great deal of time in searching European libraries for first-hand evidence on all the usually disputed points connected with his subject, and has organized and written up his results in a thoroughly interesting, as well as scholarly manner.

As a result of his theatrical experience, he brings out more clearly than the rest of us have done the vaudeville elements in the old Italian plays, and the kind of showy gifts needed and exer-

cised by the Italian actors. He has based some of his deductions on a unique series of water-color drawings in the Corsini Library of Rome, many of which he reproduces for our delight. The book, in short, is full of valuable material, with an excellent bibliography of recent studies. It is a pity, however, that there is no index, and that the proof-reading is not more perfect: Biancolelli twice misspelled on page 28, Shakespeare's Launce as Lawns on page 46, and several other similar errors slightly mar this otherwise admirable book.

WINIFRED SMITH

Vassar College.

Festschrift til HJALMAR FALK. 30 desember, 1927. Fra elever, venner og kolleger. Pp. 10 + 477. Oslo, 1927.

This is a handsome volume containing many a good contribution. Being brought as a tribute of honor to so eminent a linguist as Hj. Falk on his thirtieth anniversary as a professor, the bulk of the book naturally is taken up with linguistic studies ranging from the earliest prehistoric Germanic times down to the colloquial slang of Oslo today. It opens with a delicate little analysis not only of a sound, but also of the social and emotional background of the sound usage by *O. Broch*: "Lyden (š) som expressivt middel i Oslomålet."

The contributions to the prehistory of language are not many, it is true, but all the more weighty. *J. Sverdrup* tackles the difficult problem of the Germanic preterite in the article "Der Aorist im germanischen Verbalssystem und die Bildung des starken Preteritums." He arrives at the not new conclusion that the Germanic strong preterit is a mingled product of perfect and aorist forms. *E. Wessén*: "Till de feminina substantivböjningarnas historia" is an excellent survey of the prehistory of feminine nouns in the Scandinavian languages. A new explanation of the i-umlaut is offered by *A. Sommerfelt*: "Mangelen på i-omlyd efter kort rotstavelse." *Hj. Lindroth*: "Några anmärkningar om tenues i urgermanskan" tries to establish the pronunciation of the primitive Germanic tenues by comparing the value of the tenues in the modern Germanic languages; he does not, however, include English. He thinks that the primitive Germanic tenues were aspirated initially before a vowel, but not medially between vowels. Especially in the face of the OHG consonant shift this theory seems to be a weak one: He thinks that the difference pf-, -f(f)- reflects original aspirated—not aspirated (or weakly aspirated) tenues.¹ He does not in this

¹Cp. the view of Prokosch, *The Sounds and History of the German language*, § 32.

connection mention the fact that at the same time OHG in all probability possessed unaspirated tenuis after voiceless spirants, as *fastōn*, which were not shifted at all. To his note on the Icelandic pronunciation it is to be remarked that although nowadays unaspirated intervocalic stops are usual in perhaps two-thirds of the island, it is still an open question if that was so a century ago. For it is only during the last century that the difference between t-d, p-b, k-g was so wiped out as to cause uncertainty in writing. This state of things could be explained, it is true, by supposing the mediae b, d, g to have been distinctively voiced up to this point of time. It might be said, too, that the desonorising of b, d, g was started by Danish influence in Reykjavík. But all this would not account for the fact that the people of the Northeast with their distinctly aspirated intervocalic p, t, k always have reacted strongly upon the weak p, t, k of the Southerners, but never have had any remark to make on their b, d, g. If we are then to consider the Southern p, t, k (without asp.) original, we shall have to assume a change of voiced b, d, g > voiceless b, d, g all over the country and the change of p, t, k > p^h, t^h, k^h in the Northeast. All this considered, I think we had better reckon with aspirated p, t, k medially all over the country in the Icelandic of, say, a century ago. And if that is true, the Icelandic at least does not support the view held by the writer.

It would carry us too far to enumerate all the contributions to Middle and Modern Norwegian, among which there is even a complete dialect monograph "Østsyn over målforet i Ådal (Ringerike)" by *Olai Skulerud*. Both the old and the modern language are discussed in "Om verbets aksjonsarter i norsk" by *A. Western*.

There are, besides, many other contributions dealing with word history, literary history, folk lore, political history, and so forth. *Johan Schreiner*: "Olaf Trygvasons siste Kamp," and *E. Wadstein*: "Ett vittnesbörd om gammal frisisk förbindelse med Ryssland" are both valuable historical contributions. *Reichborn-Kjennerud*: "De gamles begreper om menneskets fysiologi" is a very substantial article. *Knut Liestøl*, "Den store Bøjgen" (of Ibsen's Peer Gynt), *Jón Helgason*: "Ett tapt håndskrift af Heiðrekssaga (Arngrímur lærði's extracts from the H. are shown to go back to a lost MS.) and, last but not least, *F. Paasche*: "Om Kongespeilets forfatter" are excellent articles. But limitations of space prevent me from discussing them. Finally, I will, however, mention one article more, as perhaps being of special interest to English students; it is *A. Trampe Bodker's* "A Study in the Colour of Eyes as represented in literature up to the time of Shakespeare."

STEFÁN EINARSSON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles. By MARY SUSAN STEELE. Cornell Studies in English. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926. Pp. xiii + 300. \$4.50.

The Court Masque. By ENID WELSFORD. Cambridge University Press, 1927. Pp. xv + 434. 25 s.

With the publication during the past year of two works dealing with the court masque, both bearing the imprint of university presses, an appreciation of the significance of this unusually interesting dramatic form has been made easier. In spite of the scholarly work of Brotanek and Reyher, not to mention the important consideration by Sir Edmund Chambers, the masque has not received from students of Tudor and Stuart drama the attention it deserves. The two most recent works to treat the masque will once more focus attention on the court revels.

Miss Steele's *Plays and Masques at Court* is not a critical discussion of court functions but, what is much more worth while for the purposes of scholarship, a chronological compilation of all the plays and masques performed before members of the royal families from 1558 to 1642. Such a contribution is a great boon to investigators in pre-Restoration drama. Miss Steele has laboriously gathered together, from many scattered sources, records of courtly representations; her labors will save scholars weary hours of tracking down references in the rather formidable body of documentary literature on the subject. Happily she included not only the plays and masques at court, but also those presented on the royal progresses; hence the work provides a comprehensive hand-list of the dramatic elements in the royal festivities throughout the great period of the drama's development. In this list we have an easy and striking method of comparing the dramatic tastes of the courts of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, and the consequent reflections in the popular theatre. The materials for a systematic survey of the court revels also give further approaches to important phases of English social and political history.

In addition to giving a chronological list of court dramatics, Miss Steele reprints briefly significant comment from such sources as the *Documents of the Revels*, the *Calendar of State Papers*, Nichols's *Progresses*, etc., so that the compilation will furnish many facts and clues for additional investigation in this field. That Miss Steele's work is a doctoral dissertation directed by Professor J. Q. Adams is one assurance of its careful scholarship.

To *The Court Masque*, Miss Enid Welsford adds as a sub-title, "A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels." She divides her work into three parts: The Origin and History of

the Masque, the Influence of the Masque, and the Significance of the Revels.

Although the writer modestly claims that her "chief aim has been to interpret and to coördinate rather than to accumulate facts," she has advanced many fresh suggestions and some new facts from the realm of comparative literature in providing a synthesis of scholarship on the origins and history of the masque. This portion of the treatise, it seems to me, is Miss Welsford's most valuable contribution. That the influence of the masque on English literature is a theme for a book, the author acknowledges, and her rather sketchy treatment of the subject confirms this statement. She concerns herself chiefly with Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, but even here she does not exhaust the possibilities. Of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*, Miss Welsford believes the suggestion that they should "be regarded as masques has little to recommend it"; yet she goes ahead to show that the plays are Shakespeare's transmutation of the masque into masque-like drama. At times she seems to make a distinction without a difference.

The third section, the author announces, is written in the interrogative instead of the indicative mood. She calls it "The Significance of the Revels." In reality, it is an attempt to discover the relation of the court entertainments to art and aesthetics, and to formulate some sort of philosophy of the revels. The result is frequently far from clear, and the reasoning is often tenuous. Yet Miss Welsford's acquaintance with comparative literature makes her discussion of origins well worth-while; her criticisms and interpretation of the relation of the masque to other literary forms are suggestive; and the work as a whole is a helpful contribution to a study of the masque and its place in English literary history.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

The Johns Hopkins University.

The Influence of Edgar Allan Poe in France. By CÉLESTIN PIERRE CAMBIAIRE. New York, 1927. 332 pp.

This study is an elaborate consideration of Poe's vogue and influence in France. Something had been done in this direction by earlier scholars,—in particular, by Professor G. D. Morris in his study of French critical opinion of Poe;¹ but Professor Cambiaire

¹ George D. Morris, *Fenimore Cooper et Edgar Poe*, Paris, 1912.

has gone into the subject with an elaborateness and a wealth of detail that would seem to be well nigh exhaustive.

In bringing out Poe's vogue in France Dr. Cambiaire deals first with the earliest critical comments on Poe by the French and certain early translations and adaptations of Poe's stories, and manages in this connection to lay the ghost of an alleged translation of Poe's stories said to have been made by Isabelle Meunier and published at Paris in book form in 1816, and in the same connection he disposes in like fashion of an alleged translation of Poe's "Murders in the Rue Morgue" traditionally held to have been published in the Paris *Charivari* in 1841.

He next considers the subject of Poe's influence upon French poetry, developing at length his influence on Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Paul Verlaine, and Maurice Rollinat among others; after which he traces Poe's influence on the short story in France, and especially his influence on Villiers de L'Isle-Adam, Henri de Régnier, Richépin, and Huysmans—and he notes also certain interesting points of resemblance between Maupassant and Poe, to which, however, he cautiously avoids attaching much significance. Concluding chapters of lesser scope are devoted to Poe's influence on Jules Verne and the pseudo-scientific novel, on the detective novel (especially of Gaboriau and Eugène Sue), and on the dramas of Sardou and Maeterlinck.

Professor Cambiaire maintains that Poe played an important part in moulding modern French literature,—that he was "one of the many influences that inspired" the Parnassian School, that he had much to do with the rise of the Symbolist school in France, and that he has exerted a far-reaching influence on the recent developments in French fiction; he holds, indeed, that Poe's name is "connected with almost every literary movement which has taken place in France since the second half of the nineteenth century." In his enthusiasm for his subject Dr. Cambiaire even suggests that Poe possibly exerted an influence on the vers-librists, though he wisely does not insist on this point.

Much of the evidence that Dr. Cambiaire adduces is drawn from the work of others (and here he is careful with his documentation); but aside from his service in weighing and sifting the judgments of others, he also presents a good body of fresh matter of his own, notably in his comments on Jules Verne, Verlaine, Sardou, and Maeterlinck.

Altogether Dr. Cambiaire's work is a highly creditable study of a very fertile field, and should take high rank among the numerous studies of Poe that have appeared in recent years.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

The University of Texas.

BRIEF MENTION

James Kirke Paulding, versatile American. By AMOS L. HEROLD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. xiii + 167. This dissertation throws some new light on a well-nigh forgotten figure, to whom attention has recently been called, says Dr. Herold, by Professors Van Doren and Pattee. Paulding's chief importance seems to lie in his sympathetic handling of the Dutch tradition in New York, and in his following Fielding rather than Scott as a novelist. There is in one chapter an entertaining account of his career as Secretary of the Navy, and a brief and useful synopsis of his novels in another. Of these novels only *The Dutchman's Fireside* seems to have much interest now, but one is glad to have a fairly complete list of Paulding's other fiction, including his tales, for ready reference. Otherwise, the dissertation is disappointing. Dr. Herold says that Mr. Wegelin's *Bibliography of the Separate Publications of Paulding* "contains several inaccuracies"—a somewhat uncharitable remark from one who considers "Van Buren Correspondence in Congressional Library" a sufficient reference for a letter from Van Buren to Jackson about Paulding's appointment as Secretary of the Navy; and who dates Poe's criticism of Paulding's *Life of Washington* simply "1835" though it appeared May, 1836. Dr. Herold writes of Peter Irving, "In 1802 he established and published for three or four years a four-page daily newspaper, *The Morning Chronicle*, one of the half-dozen papers then issued in New York," and adds as a footnote, "*The Morning Chronicle* (1802-1806); *Life and Letters of Washington Irving*" without explaining why he did not give the date of the first issue, if he consulted a file, as the note would indicate. Indeed, exact dates and page references are frequently omitted for no apparent reason; newspaper search, even in readily accessible periodicals like Willis's *Corsair*, and the *Washington National Intelligencer*, seems to have been avoided; and much of the criticism is jejune,—we are informed, for example, that Paulding "genially preached the gospel of work, anticipating both Carlyle and Ruskin." Paulding's relations with Halleck are satisfactorily handled, but the discussion of those with Hawthorne is confusing and not convincing, and that of those with Poe neither accurate nor thorough. A few new letters of Paulding are printed from manuscripts at Yale and in the New York Public Library, but the field of Paulding's biography can hardly be considered exhausted.

THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT.

Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell. Cambridge, The Harvard University Press, 1926. Pp. x + 320. No doubt many a reader is more fortunate than the writer of these lines in an acquaintance with the great teacher to whose memory these essays are offered. But at least to have seen him plain, to have heard him address a crowded Sanders Theatre, is to carry away an abiding impression of a manifold and stimulating force.

For a variety of reasons, this sheaf of studies is no ordinary tribute. The writers are not only a group of distinguished men from among the many who admired Mr. Wendell, but every one of them assisted him in one or other of his Harvard courses. In a very subtle way the many-sided quality of the master is to be felt in the interests and turn of mind of these his chosen associates. If there was something about Wendell that attracted them to him, there was something also about them as young men and scholars that drew Wendell.

This consideration brings one to the task, impossible to perform within the limits of a brief review, of giving some notion of the multiple direction and long reach of the mental journeyings recorded in these eighteen papers. The promise, held out by the titles, of a wide-cast net of interest is amply fulfilled by the text. Ripe criticism, friendly and provocative, is everywhere. We are taken from philosophy to romance, from lyric poetry to political theory. We are invited to consider, among others, Dante, Chaucer, Cervantes, Marlowe, Li-Po, Scott, Arnold, Yeats, Conrad, Alan Seeger, and Jack Reed. We visit Can Grande's Verona, London in the Middle Ages and under Elizabeth, the Gardens of Fragrance of Iran, La Mancha, the Land of Heart's Desire, Torres Strait, Belloy-en-Santerre, the wall of the Communist Kremlin. And somehow it is all related to Grays Hall in Harvard Yard, to the man who ranged a wide and fertile field of ideas, from Cotton Mather to modern America, from Eginhard to twentieth-century France. Fittingly, the two first papers are able and significant studies of Wendell himself. Through them the reader is offered a fascinatingly direct view of the teacher and philosopher as he was, not in the pages of a book, but to his pupils and friends. Perhaps the greatest tribute to Wendell, a conservative of fearless and adventuring mind, is his recognized power of drawing to himself honest thinkers of radically divergent creeds.

LESLIE HOTSON.

A Short History of English, with a bibliography of recent books on the subject, and lists of texts and editions. By HENRY CEOTL WYLD. Third edition, revised and enlarged. New York, Dutton, 1927. Pp. viii + 294. \$2.50. Students of the English Language

will greet with pleasure the third edition of Professor Henry Cecil Wyld's *A Short History of English*. It is indeed "revised and enlarged," for the author has incorporated in it not only his own investigations in Colloquial English and in the poets' rhymes, but also the new material brought to light by Miss Serjeantson on the West Midland dialects and by Miss Mackenzie on the London dialect. That he has thus included and rendered accessible in his *Short History* the results of these recent investigations, will be a source of gratitude to those who work in the field. The revision is extensive and has been very thoroughly done; a large part of the book has been rewritten; and the enrichments make it in a very real sense a new book. As would be expected, the greatest changes are in the sections dealing with Colloquial English, Modern English, and the West Midland and the London dialects. A whole new section of twenty pages has been prefixed to the chapter on Modern English. Very welcome are the rearrangement of the summaries of the features of the Midland dialects into a comparative table, and the addition of tables showing the chief characteristics of the London-Middlesex and the Essex and City of London dialects.

The numbering of the sections in the second edition has been ingeniously retained for a great part of the book, so that most of the references to the old edition will apply to the new.

In these days of the high cost of scholarly publications, it is a comfort to see so fine and indispensable a book at so reasonable a price.

RUDOLPH WILLARD.

La Chanson d'Aspremont, d'après un poème du xiii^e siècle (Paris: Boivin, [1925], xvi + 208 pp.), by Professor LOUIS BRANDIN, is a worthy successor to his first modernisation, *Berthe au grand pied*. The charm and success of the latter may be judged by the fact that it went through six editions in about two years. *Aspremont* has been treated along similar lines. The picturesque and even fantastic elements of the original are brought out in an eminently readable rehandling; the second part of the story is especially well told. The narrative gains by being relieved of the *longueurs* of the original. The touches of humor of the Old French poem are carefully preserved, as in the vivid episode of the four youths (pp. 37-41) and elsewhere. Some of the lines are short-breathed, giving an impression of brokenness and abruptness akin to that of the mediaeval text. M. Joseph Bédier's spirited preface outlines and evaluates the poem and enables the reader of to-day to see it in its proper setting. There is an enduring eloquence in such phrases as (pp. xv-xvi): "Le jongleur, de toute

sa force, de toute sa voix, . . . lance ses strophes: il n'a pas d'auditeur qui lui soit plus cher que celui-là qui l'écoute encore sept siècles après qu'il s'est tu."

D. S. B.

The Nature of Human Speech. By SIR RICHARD PAGET, BART. S. P. E. Tract No. XXII, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1925. \$1.20. *English Vowel-Sounds.* By W. A. AIKIN, with an Introduction by Robert Bridges. S. P. E. Tract No. XXVI, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, 1927. \$0.85. Sir Richard Paget's vowel scale shows the vowels according to the pitch of their characteristic resonances. Like Dr. Aikin's somewhat similar scale, it is not objectively verifiable by others. Miller¹ finds different results. His computations from the phonodeik had shown the characteristics of vowels to be regions of resonance reinforcing harmonic partials of fairly constant pitch for each vowel regardless of the fundamental pitch. Paget finds two resonances for each vowel. Miller had found only one for back vowels and two for front. He artificially reproduced back vowels with one resonance, and converted front to back by eliminating one resonance. Paget's theory that consonants are also determined by resonance requires verification. Miller produced artificial consonants without providing such resonance. Paget's experiments, as described by him,² depend on his remarkable acoustic skill, but his results have not gone unquestioned.³ Paget's contention that an ideal language should lack voiceless consonants is perhaps sufficiently answered by the editor; but two points may be added. For intelligibility, contrast is as important as sonority. Secondly, since every voiceless sound may become voiced, the number of possible articulations would be greatly diminished. Paget's work contains much suggestive experiment, but his application of it to explaining the origin of language is scarcely to be called scientific.

JOHN S. KENYON.

¹ Dayton C. Miller, *The Science of Musical Sounds*, New York, 1916; 2nd ed. 1926.

² *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, A*, vols. 102, 106.

³ See Stephen Jones, *Le Maître Phonétique*, Oct.-Nov., 1924, p. 24.

Through no fault of M. Koszul an error crept into his review of Mr. Peck's *Shelley* between galley and page proof. *MLN*, XLIII, 397, ll. 18, 19, should read: "'tranquillity of freedom', again in a quotation, should be 'of freemen.'"

THE EDITORS.

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

DECEMBER, 1928

Number 8

SOME RECENT LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Since time immemorial linguistics has been a handmaid to philology. The very word *grammarian* originally meant 'man of letters,' and the study of language was undertaken not for its own sake but for its practical value in promoting good speech and good writing. Such is still the only point and purpose of linguistic study in our primary and secondary schools, and even in our colleges, with their courses in English grammar, rhetoric and composition. The professional philologist, however, is rarely interested in this aspect of the matter. So far as he prosecutes linguistic studies at all, he does so because these studies throw light on the literary monuments he is interested in. Linguistics is only one of the many tools which he uses to help him in his study of literature. But it is possible to study the phenomena of language without reference to the problems of philology. One may abandon literature altogether, and take up linguistics as an independent discipline, as a branch of knowledge worthy of study for its own sake. Thus the linguist, parting company with the philologist, comes into his own.

From this point of view one of the most significant events of recent years was the organization of the *Linguistic Society of America* with its monograph series, its dissertation series, its quarterly journal *Language* and its summer school *The Linguistic Institute*.¹ The new Society has already proved its worth by stimulating interest in linguistics as such, and by providing means for the publication of the results of linguistic research.² But it

¹ The first session of the *Institute* was held at Yale University in the summer of 1928.

² So far it has published three *Language Monographs* (E. A. Esper's *Technique for the Experimental Investigation of Associative Interference in Artificial Linguistic Material*; R. G. Kent's *Textual Criticism of Inscript-*

must not be imagined that the *Linguistic Society* was founded to put new life into a branch of scholarship which was losing ground. On the contrary, it was the ever-increasing activity of the linguists and their ever-increasing numbers which finally brought them together in a Society all their own. I think it may safely be said that American linguistic scholarship was never so flourishing as it is today.

Perhaps the most important, and certainly the most useful piece of linguistic work turned out of late in America is not linguistic at all, properly speaking, but bibliographical. I refer to Professor Kennedy's bibliography of English linguistics.¹ The author tells us that his book is the result of some fourteen years' research. His time has been well spent. The bibliography is a model, and an ornament to American scholarship. It belongs to that limited number of books which, immediately upon their publication, become indispensable. The title is not altogether accurate, as the author has included a few items of a date later than 1922, but such items, of course, are in the nature of bounties, for which one must be duly thankful. In item 331, I note a reference to an edition of 1608 which does not seem to exist. Professor Max Förster's name is misspelt on p. 35 (item 792). In the Modern-English word-list I looked up *father*, *rather* (p. 317) to see if my article on those two words was cited; it was not! But I found it duly listed on p. 278. Skeat's lecture on "The King's English" (item 790) was first printed, I believe, in A. Bowker's volume, *The King Alfred Millenary*, pp. 166-178. But errors and omissions of any kind are extremely rare in this admirable volume. The only serious criticism of the book, indeed, is its price, which is staggering and puts it out of reach of everybody except libraries, millionaires and reviewers.

In linguistic work proper, perhaps the greatest recent advances have been made in the long neglected field of place-name study. The valuable work of the Swedish scholars who maintain the place-name journal *Namn och Bygd*, and of the German scholars who

tions; and F. A. Wood's *Post-Consonantal W in Indo-European*) and one *Language Dissertation* (Ruth Norton Albright's *Vedic Declension of the Type Vr̥k̥is*).

¹ A. G. Kennedy, *A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the End of 1922*. Pp. xviii + 517. Cambridge (Mass.) and New Haven (Conn.), 1927.

have founded the *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung*, is well known. For the Anglo-Saxon world, however, the activities of the *English Place-Name Society* must stand in the foreground. The two latest volumes published by this Society maintain worthily the exacting standards set in its earlier publications.⁴ Here and there, it is true, one may find doubtful etymologies and even mistakes. The word *wacel* (III 7) does not show i-umlaut in its stem vowel. The *a*-forms of *Bolnhurst* and *Colworth* (III 13 and 40) are left unexplained; a reference to my article on the subject in *Modern Philology* (xx 189 ff.) would have been in place. The variant *Portenhale* of the place-name *Pertenhull* (III 16 f.) is listed but not discussed; a parallel development of an *o* before *r*-combination is to be found in the familiar word *acorn*, where the *o* is *not* due to false etymological association with *corn* but is a strictly phonetic development. The explanation given for the phonology of *Upbury* (III 161) is hardly sound: the sound-change *tb* > *pb* is an example of place-assimilation, and no intermediate stage *db* is to be assumed. The etymology favored for *Lymage* (III 271) is weak, since no variant form **Livening* occurs, although OE *m*, in the combination *mn*, regularly had a spirantic pronunciation reflected in the frequent *f*-spelling (ME *v*-). I cannot accept the etymology given for *Winrick* (IV 62), in view of the fact that the earliest spelling is *Wynedwarwik*, a form which points to an OE **Wynedwara wic* 'dairy-farm of the men from Wyned (i. e., Gwynedd or North Wales).' Cf. *Willingwick* (IV 345) 'dairy-farm of the men of Willa' and *Pensax* (IV xliii) 'Saxon settlement at Pen.' But in spite of these details, I find myself almost always in agreement with the editors, whose mastery of their subject is evident, and whose industry has given the Society two more volumes, admirable alike in style and substance.⁵

The place-name field is perhaps less interesting in America, but it is worth cultivating, none the less. Mr. Meany, Miss Fitzpatrick and Mr. Read⁶ have given us pioneer works in the American field,

⁴ Vol. III, *The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire*, pp. xlii + 316. Cambridge, 1926. Vol. IV, *The Place-Names of Worcestershire*, pp. xliv + 420. Cambridge, 1927. A review of vols. I and II appeared in *MLN.*, XLII, 259 f.

⁵ Another study in the same field is Mr. David Hopwood's *Place-Names of the County of Surrey*, pp. x + 101, Capetown, 1926.

⁶ E. S. Meany, *Origin of Washington Geographic Names*, Seattle, 1923;

and it is to be hoped that many others will follow their example. In the journal *American Speech* (178 ff.) Mr. Louis N. Feipel has recently offered what he modestly calls "a few prolegomena to the study" of American place-names; to this article the curious are referred for a survey of the field and suggestions as to future work.

American provincial speech has attracted a certain amount of attention in the last two or three years. The monographs of Mr. Heil and Mr. Orbeck⁷ are both devoted to the dialect of New England. The work of Mr. Heil suffers somewhat from the fact that it is based on a piece of dialectal literature rather than on actual New England speech; one cannot be sure of Lowell's accuracy and one can be sure that dialectal accuracy was not his primary purpose in writing the *Biglow Papers*. Mr. Orbeck, dealing as he does with records, is on surer ground, and has done a useful piece of work. Similar studies of old records in the other colonial centers are greatly needed. Mr. Smith's interesting study⁸ is not so much an exhaustive examination as a running sketch of the peculiarities of the Gullah dialect (the form of English spoken by the negroes of the Carolina-Georgia coast), together with a full Gullah bibliography. The pamphlet runs to 45 pages. It was evidently written for the general reader as well as for the scholar, and certainly makes interesting reading.

Turning now to more general works, we find ample evidence of linguistic interest and activity. In 1923 Mr. Mencken's *American Language* reached its third edition,⁹ and the author promises us a fourth in his good time. In spite of serious defects, due to the author's lack of training as a professional linguist, Mr. Mencken's book remains the best thing we have on its subject. Hard on Mr. Mencken's heels came Mr. Kenyon with a work intended as a

L. L. Fitzpatrick, *Nebraska Place-Names*, Lincoln, 1925; W. A. Read, *Louisiana Place-Names of Indian Origin*, Baton Rouge, 1927.

⁷ J. A. Heil, *Die Volkssprache im Nordosten der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, dargestellt auf Grund der Biglow papers von James Russell [sic] Lowell*, Giessener Beiträge, III, 2, Breslau, 1926; A. Orbeck, *Early New England Pronunciation, as reflected in some 17th century town records of eastern Massachusetts*, George Wahr, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1927.

⁸ Reed Smith, *Gullah*, Bulletin of the University of South Carolina, Nov. 1, 1926.

⁹ H. L. Mencken, *The American Language*, 3d. ed., pp. x + 489. Knopf, New York, 1923.

handbook of phonetics.¹⁰ It is in fact an excellent piece of research as well. Mr. Kenyon gives a systematic account of the phonology of American English. He is a trained phonetician, an accurate observer, and a good writer. I cannot subscribe to some of his views: his theory of stops seems to me untenable, and his account of the articulation of the semivowels and liquids is hardly sound. But on the whole his book is far more than the college textbook which it purports to be. Wider in scope is Mr. Krapp's history of American English.¹¹ The work has a wealth of accurate detail, and is distinctly readable, though here, of course, Mr. Krapp suffers by comparison with Mr. Mencken. The title does not commit the author to a systematic history of American English, and the author does not give us such a history. His work impresses me rather as a series of articles, sometimes extended into monographs, on various aspects of his general subject. We ought to be thankful for what we get, and not expect too much, but many readers will probably share my disappointment that the author did not give us that systematic history which we so badly need and which he is so well equipped to write.

Perhaps Mr. Krapp felt that a truly scientific history of American English could not be undertaken until more spade-work had been done, and certainly there is room for a multitude of monographs on matters of detail yet obscure. But most of all an authoritative historical dictionary of American English is needed. The University of Chicago has recently undertaken the preparation of such a dictionary, and has called Sir William A. Craigie, of the staff of the now happily completed *Oxford Dictionary*, to take charge of the work. Under his expert guidance the new undertaking is making good progress, and we may reasonably hope to have in our hands the completed work before many years have elapsed. In the meantime we must depend on the *Oxford Dictionary* for the history of American usage. Needless to say, the record there given is anything but full. In particular, the American peculiarities of pronunciation receive scant recognition. Mr. H. E. Palmer has recently tried to help us out here by including

¹⁰ J. S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, George Wahr, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1924.

¹¹ G. P. Krapp, *The English Language in America*. Vol. I, pp. xvi + 377; vol. II, pp. vi + 355. The Century Co., New York, 1925.

in his pronouncing dictionary a list of American pronunciations.¹² The dictionary is printed with three columns to the page. In the first column appear the words in their traditional spelling; the second and third columns give phonetic respellings to indicate respectively the "received pronunciation" and the "American variants." If the American pronunciation does not differ from the "received" it is not recorded at all. This method is no doubt economical, but it is misleading, in spite of a good deal of explanation in the preface and introductory notes. The American variants for the most part represent what we call Western speech; the East and the South get short shrift. And although I cannot speak with authority about Western pronunciation, I have noted transcriptions of it which I am sceptical about; thus, *artist* hardly has a vocalic *r*; if pronounced at all, the *r* has its ordinary consonantal value, and the word is made up of two syllables, not of three.

Mr. Palmer's dictionary was written primarily for the student. Mr. Krapp's latest books¹³ are aimed rather at the general public, although the student too might well find them instructive. The *Guide* is cast into dictionary form, and reminds one of Mr. H. W. Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, which was reviewed in an earlier volume of this journal (XLII, 201 f.). Mr. Krapp's book is less lively reading than Mr. Fowler's, but it is far more trustworthy; Mr. Krapp, unlike Mr. Fowler, has the scientific point of view, and gives us an objective discussion of nearly all the points he takes up. Occasionally, it is true, he departs from objectivity, as when he tells us that *mamma* is "sometimes" pronounced with the stress on the first syllable; here, I fancy, the wish is father to the dictum, and certainly this pronunciation is far more prevalent than the author's "sometimes" would lead the reader to suspect. Again, the author fails to recognize the not infrequent spelling-pronunciation of the surname *Mainwaring*, and reduces to a mere "sometimes" the extremely common past participle *gotten* for the *got* which he seems to prefer. *Parlor* too is much oftener used than the author thinks; I can see no jus-

¹² H. E. Palmer, J. V. Martin and F. G. Blandford, *A Dictionary of English Pronunciation with American Variants*, pp. xlix + 436. Appleton, New York, 1927.

¹³ G. P. Krapp, *A Comprehensive Guide to Good English*, pp. xxxviii + 688, Rand, McNally, Chicago, 1927; *The Knowledge of English*, pp. x + 572, Holt, New York, 1927.

tification for the statement that it is going out of use. I have found few downright errors in the book. It would have been more accurate to call *gillie* a Gaelic word, since *Scotch* is ambiguous in itself, and leaves Ireland out of account. The French city *Reims* is so spelt in French. As regards omissions, opinions will naturally differ. Since the author includes so many proper names in order to indicate their pronunciation, he might have added *Croce* to the list; many a would-be intellectual has suffered because he did not know whether the philosopher's *o* was open or close. Various other matters of detail might be brought up, but the book as a whole may with confidence be commended.

Mr. Krapp's *Knowledge of English* is best described as a series of essays on various topics connected with English linguistics. It is a work of *vulgarisation* in the best sense of that term. Particularly to be praised is the author's recognition of the English vocabulary as "bi-lingual," i. e., as made up of two distinct groups of words, called "plain English" and "bookish English." Here the author follows Mr. Luick, I take it, who makes the same distinction in his *Grammatik*. It must not be supposed, however, that English in this respect differs radically from other languages. Most languages are more or less "bi-lingual" in the same sense. It is equally erroneous to suppose that the "plain English" words are the words etymologically native, and that the bookish words are the words of French and Latin origin. The distinction between the two classes is based on usage, not on etymology, and words like *fool* and *easy* are no less "plain English" because of their French provenience.

The same division of the English vocabulary into two parts appears in Mr. Fries's recent volume,¹⁴ but Mr. Fries names the parts *Anglo-Saxon* and *Latin* respectively (p. 97). That *Anglo-Saxon* means "plain English" to Mr. Fries becomes clear when we note that he applies the term to the word *catch*, which is of French origin, and to the word *jump*, which is a modern coinage. The author has not invented his terms, of course; on the contrary, they are widely and, I think, legitimately used as he uses them. Mr. Fries's book is designed as a manual for teachers, but it could be read with profit by almost any English-speaking person of in-

¹⁴ C. C. Fries, *The Teaching of the English Language*, pp. 187. Nelson, New York, 1927.

telligence. He describes the book as "an effort to interpret the modern scientific view of language in a practical way for teachers." He succeeds admirably in this effort, and it is to be hoped that every teacher of English in our public schools may read the volume and take its lessons to heart.

Mr. Callaway's two essays on the historic study of the mother tongue are equally valuable, though from another point of view.¹⁵ In his first essay Mr. Callaway gives us a short but remarkably complete history of American activity in historical English grammar. In his second essay he discusses (with full bibliographical notices) recent activity in the same field, including this time European as well as American work in his survey. The essays are written with vigor and make exceedingly interesting reading.

Following Mr. Callaway's example, I will now turn to Europe. I have already mentioned the new volumes of the *English Place-Name Society* and Mr. Hopwood's monograph on the place-names of Surrey. Mr. Weekley has lately given us yet another volume.¹⁶ It consists of 91 essays on as many compound words, and in every way may be taken as a companion to his earlier work, *Words Ancient and Modern*.¹⁷ His methods have not changed. He writes interestingly and not too profoundly, for the general public and not for the scholar. His rambling methods may be indicated by the fact that his discussions of *lord* and *lady* appear under the heading *beefeater*. Nor can he be trusted to get the facts right. Under *honeymoon* he mentions a non-existent "Old Norse *hjunottsmanalhr*" (p. 77) and under *runagate* we learn that the word is "in general dialect use" in America for a gadabout.

More representative of English linguistic scholarship is the latest Wright grammar.¹⁸ Its title is somewhat misleading, as the authors go into phonology, at least, in much greater detail than

¹⁵ Morgan Callaway, Jr., *The Historic Study of the Mother Tongue in the United States: a Survey of the Past, and The Present-Day Attitude Toward the Historic Study of the Mother Tongue*, University of Texas Bulletin No. 2538, Studies in English vol. v, pp. 5-67. Austin, 1925.

¹⁶ E. Weekley, *More Words Ancient and Modern*, pp. viii + 192. Dutton, New York, 1927.

¹⁷ For a review of this work, see *MLN.* XLII, 61.

¹⁸ Joseph Wright and Elizabeth Mary Wright, *An Elementary Historical New English Grammar*, pp. xii + 224. Oxford University Press, New York, 1924.

one would expect in an elementary work. Here the book reminds us of Bülbring's *Elementarbuch*. On the other hand, the "elementary" of the title is justified to this extent at least: the grammar is not exhaustive, and is a handbook for students rather than a contribution to knowledge. One may in general say that the authors, although they are thoroughly competent to deal with their subject, have not kept altogether abreast of recent research. Hence there are errors or unfortunate statements now and then. Thus, the *a* of *Thames* is hardly due to Latin influence (p. 40), and the history of *father* and *rather* is incorrectly sketched (p. 66). Other errors seem to be due to carelessness, as the description (p. 8) of the writing of *-y* for final *-i* or *-ie* as an "improvement." It is unfortunate that the Wrights cling to outworn and misleading terms like *guttural* (pp. 121 ff.). In the discussion of the *ch* of French loan-words, some explanation of our pronunciation of words like *chivalry* ought to be given (p. 126). But in spite of these and other weaknesses in detail, the grammar is a good one, and does credit to its authors. It is a pity that Mr Wright's health has been such as to prevent him and his wife from finishing the monumental *Historical English Grammar* to which we have all been looking forward, but it is our good fortune that in 1925 the Wrights were able to get out a third edition of their excellent *Old English Grammar*.

A great deal of good work has been done in recent years by various European scholars in the field of English grammar, both historical and descriptive. Mr. Wyld has followed the example of the Wrights by getting out a third edition of his useful *Short History of English*. The new edition is described as "revised and enlarged," and with justice. The fundamental character of the work has not changed, however; it is still confined to phonology and morphology (chiefly the former), and is meant to serve as a handbook for students. The center of interest in the book is, quite properly, the origin and development of that particular dialect of English which we call the standard English of today. Mr. Zachrisson in his latest monograph has concentrated his efforts even more narrowly.¹⁹ He has examined minutely all the works

¹⁹ R. E. Zachrisson, *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time, as Taught by William Bullokar, with Word-lists from all his Works*. Pp. xvi + 243. Uppsala, 1927.

of the sixteenth century English phonetician William Bullokar, and on the basis of this material, together with further material drawn from English records of the early modern period, he has attempted to determine the state of English pronunciation in Bullokar's day. The monograph is a highly important one, and its author, in my opinion, has succeeded in solving more than one moot question in the field which he has investigated. In particular I would call attention to his admirable discussion (pp. 65 ff.) of the early NE. development of ME. *au* and ME. short *o*. The new evidence which he brings forward here is confirmatory of the evidence which I presented some years ago in an article on the diphthong *au*.²⁰

Another important event of 1927 was the publication of the third part of Mr. Jespersen's monumental English grammar, together with an appendix to the second part.²¹ The first syntactical volume came out in 1914, but the war put a stop to the progress of the work, and only now is the great grammar once more on the road to completion. The new volume shows us the old Jespersen. As always, he is here master of his material, full of brilliant and original interpretations, and delightful to read. More than any other linguist of today, Mr. Jespersen goes his own way, and the road is a fascinating one indeed. Occasionally, it is true, one finds him a bit astray. Thus, he explains the Englishman's preference for *he gave it me* and the American's for *he gave it to me* by saying, "this may perhaps be ascribed to the greater natural freedom and ease often found in British speech, while (educated) Americans are more constrained in their anxiety to avoid errors" (p. 290). Whatever the explanation may be for the difference in idiom here, Mr. Jespersen has missed it. But such flights of fancy are rare indeed. Usually the author's explanations are thoroughly reasonable in themselves, and buttressed besides with a formidable array of examples and parallels. No student of English syntax can afford to leave this volume unread.

The general principles which Mr. Jespersen has applied so well to English are set forth by him at greater length in two compara-

²⁰ Printed in *Modern Philology*, xx, 189 ff.

²¹ O. Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar*, Part II, Syntax, First Volume, Appendix, pp. 485-512; Part III, Syntax, Second Volume, pp. x + 415. Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1927.

tively recent works, *Language* and the *Philosophy of Grammar*,²² which I will not discuss here. The philosophy of speech has lately been taken up, from a different point of view, by the Swiss linguist Otto Funke, who promises us a series of monographs on the history of this field of study. The first two of these are now in print, in a single volume.²³ The volume begins with a study called *Zur Sprachphilosophie des 18. Jahrhunderts: J. Harris' "Hermes."* Mr. Funke gives us an acute analysis and criticism of Harris's work, and shows in detail its connexion with the ideas of the time. The monograph is an admirable example of the study of the history of ideas. There follows a second monograph called *Zur Sprachphilosophie der Gegenwart*. In this study Mr. Funke examines recent work in linguistic theory in the German-speaking world. He divides the scholars whom he studies into three groups: the romanticists (Cassirer, Porzig, Weissgerber), the estheticists (Vossler), and the empiricists (Paul, Marty, Bühler). The romanticists get their inspiration ultimately from Humboldt, the estheticists from Croce. The empiricists base their work on modern experimental psychology. Needless to say, Mr. Funke himself is an empiricist. His detailed account of the three schools makes interesting reading, and is a distinct contribution to the history of ideas in the field of linguistic theory.

But let us revert to English grammar. Mr. Jespersen's grammar is primarily historical rather than descriptive. The Dutch linguist, Mr. H. Poutsma, has given us a grammar of even greater proportions which is primarily descriptive, though history is resorted to more or less.²⁴ In four huge volumes he has gathered together a staggering array of quotations from English writers, in illustration of the various grammatical points which he makes. So far as I know, no grammarian who has ever written on any language has got together so vast a lot of material. Moreover, he has given to this mass of evidence an excellent organization. He is a trained and thorough syntactician, with ideas of his own, although he sticks to the traditional categories for the most part. I find myself in frequent disagreement with him in matters of theory, but I will content myself here with paying tribute to his

²² Ably reviewed by Mildred E. Lambert, in *MLN.*, XLII, 339 ff.

²³ O. Funke, *Studien zur Sprachphilosophie*, pp. 140, Bern, 1927.

²⁴ H. Poutsma, *Grammar of Late Modern English*, Gröningen, 1904-1926.

erudition and his overwhelming industry. Similarly descriptive, though of course on a much smaller scale, is the well known grammar of Mr. Kruisinga's, now in its fourth edition.²⁵ This work, likewise in four volumes, differs from that of Mr. Poutsma in another respect: the first volume is devoted to phonology, a department which Mr. Poutsma neglects. Just out are two more English grammars by Dutch authors: Mr. Kruisinga's shorter work on accident and syntax, in its fourth edition, and Mr. Vechtman-Veth's work on syntax.²⁶ These books are of a more elementary character, of course, but I fear they would not seem elementary to the average American college student. They bear witness to the solidity of Dutch linguistic scholarship, in the English field at least.

In the field of general phonetics Mr. Forchhammer has just published another volume.²⁷ It is meant for use as a handbook, and seems to be nothing more than an abridgement of the same author's *Grundlage der Phonetik*.²⁸ Like the larger work, it is vigorously written. It is well equipped with pictures, charts and tables, and in the hands of a teacher trained in orthodox phonetics it might be a highly serviceable manual. But in important respects Mr. Forchhammer's phonetic theory is unsound, and such a book therefore cannot be placed unreservedly in the hands of untrained students.

I will conclude this survey by giving brief mention to the first piece of instrumental phonetic research ever done in the Icelandic field (let us hope it will not be the last). Mr. Einarsson in a notable doctor's dissertation²⁹ has presented the results which he obtained by applying the instrumental technic to various problems of Icelandic phonetics. He took up such matters as the place of articulation of the sounds, nasality, voice, length and accent, and came to conclusions which in some cases may be called definitive.

²⁵ E. Kruisinga, *A Handbook of Present-Day English*, Utrecht, 1925.

²⁶ E. Kruisinga, *An English Grammar for Dutch Students*, vol. I, *A Shorter Accidence and Syntax*, pp. xvi + 230, Utrecht, 1928; A. C. E. Vechtman-Veth, *A Syntax of Living English*, pp. xii + 330, Utrecht, 1928.

²⁷ J. Forchhammer, *Kurze Einführung in die deutsche und allgemeine Sprachlautlehre*, pp. 124, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1928.

²⁸ See my review of this work in *MLN.* XL, 424 ff.

²⁹ Stefán Einarsson, *Beiträge zur Phonetik der Isländischen Sprache*, pp. 144, Oslo, 1927.

By way of adverse criticism it may be noted that while the author (p. 14) rightly points out the difference in articulation between Icelandic and English *v*, he fails to make it clear that a fully parallel difference exists between Icelandic and English *ð*. In each case the English sound has edge or "coronal" articulation, while the Icelandic sound has ridge or "dorsal" articulation. Any Anglo-Saxon who tries to speak Icelandic will find that his *v* and *ð* are markedly different from the corresponding sounds of Icelandic. To one who wishes to learn how to pronounce Icelandic *ð*, I should advise beginning with a [j] and shifting it toward the front until a satisfactory articulation has been acquired. It was a pleasure to me to see that Mr. Einarsson's description of the characteristics of present Icelandic speech nearly always agrees with my own conclusions as recorded in my monograph on the subject,³⁰ although I came to these conclusions without the help of instruments of precision.

KEMP MALONE.

A NOTE ON BURNS'S LANGUAGE

Most of the biographers and critics who have given any thought to Burns's language, have been more interested in determining whether or not he could write well in English than in making clear the exact status of Burns's particular variety of Lowland Scots in the civilization and culture of late eighteenth century Ayrshire. On the first matter a good deal of ink has been spilt, most of it tending to the conclusion that he was ill at ease in English, and could write well only in Scots. Had he not said so himself? And were not the poems there, to prove the correctness of his own judgment?¹

Concerning the other matter, the relation between the dialect of Burns's poems and the actual speech of Burns's Maunchline or

³⁰ K. Malone, *The Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, Menasha, Wis., 1923.

¹ Recently this well-established dogma has been challenged, and, I believe it is fair to say, overthrown. See for instance W. A. Neilson, "Burns in English," *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, p. 165; and brief comments on the subject in *MLN.*, Feb., 1922, p. 77 ("Notes on Burns and England"); and in *Mod. Philol.*, Jan. 1919, p. 144 ("Notes on Burns's First Volume").

Tarbolton contemporaries, I have found myself no little puzzled. Professor Craigie's informing chapter "Language," in his *Primer of Burns*,² contains one paragraph on dialect, in which occurs the categorical statement that "although the native dialect of Burns was that of Ayrshire, there are few, if any, traces of this in his writings. He was too much under the influence of Ramsay and Fergusson to break away from the usage they had established in the writing of the Scottish tongue. His language therefore is not local, but represents the general dialect of southern Scotland, even of the east rather than the west."³

There are also suggestions in Sir James Wilson's three studies⁴ which point indirectly to the same conclusion. But Sir James's object, so far as Burns is concerned, has been primarily, to indicate how Scotsmen today pronounce Burns's verse; his work as a whole fails to make clear the relationship between the dialect of Burns's poems and the common speech of Ayrshire in 1785. And Professor Craigie's statement, suggestive and significant as it is, leaves some pertinent questions unanswered.⁵ Hence it comes that, in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, not a few students of Burns seem to have assumed that the language of "Hallowe'en" and the "Address to the Deil" was "the language of conversation in the middle and lower classes of society," or at least "a selection of language really used by men" at that time and place. They have also assumed, if my reading of the Burns literature has been representative, that Burns's choice of this dialect as a medium for poetry was in no way extraordinary or worthy of special comment, but that in writing in Scots he did what any Scotchman of his day and age would have done, but did it better.

I propose to comment briefly on these two assumptions.

² *A Primer of Burns*, by William A. Craigie, London, 1896.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

⁴ *Lowland Scotch*, Oxford, 1915; *The Dialect of Robert Burns as Spoken in Central Ayrshire*, Oxford, 1923; *Scottish Poems of Robert Burns in his Native Dialect*, Oxford, 1925. All by Sir James Wilson.

⁵ The same thing is more or less true concerning a more recent remark by Professor Craigie on the same subject. In the "Foreword" to Sir James Wilson's *The Dialect of Robert Burns*, p. 3, one reads: "Burns in his writings made no attempt to reproduce the local dialect in any exact fashion, but unquestioningly adopted the standard which had been set by his predecessors in the field of Scottish poetry."

I.

In addition to having the authority of such a linguist as Professor Craigie cast in the scale against it, the popular notion that Burns's dialect was actually the spoken language of the part of the world in which he lived is controverted by the fact—often noticed, but not commented on in this connection—that he felt it necessary to provide each of the three editions which he supervised with a carefully made glossary. That appended to the Kilmarnock (1786) edition opens with this significant note: "Words that are universally known, and *those that differ from the English* only by the elision of letters by apostrophes, or by varying the termination of the verb, are not inserted. The terminations may be thus known; the participle present, instead of *ing*, ends in the Scotch dialect, in *an* or *in*; in *an*, particularly, when the verb is composed of the participle present, and any of the tenses of the auxiliary, *to be*. The past tense and participle past are usually made by shortening the *ed* into '*t*.'" ⁶

The inclusion of the glossary, with such an introductory note, might be interpreted as an indication that Burns was writing for a wider audience than could be found in Ayrshire; that he hoped his book would find its way into the hands of English readers, to whom it would be unintelligible without a glossary. Had this been the case, however, the glossary would have been seriously inadequate; throughout the volume one meets words almost certainly unintelligible to English readers, and yet unexplained in the glossary.⁷ No, the glossary seems to me to have been intended for precisely the persons who found it appended to their copies of the book—Burns's Ayrshire friends and neighbors, and to have been made necessary by the fact that Burns's literary dialect was different from, and in some respects perhaps more "Scottish" than, that used by the purchasers of these volumes.⁸ Had this not been

⁶ *Facsimile of the Original Kilmarnock Edition*, Kilmarnock, 1909, D. Brown and Co., p. 236. Italics mine in clause beginning "those that differ."

⁷ For instance, in the first 27 lines of the first poem, "The Twa Dogs," one discovers *bonie*, *thrang*, *lugs*, *whalpet*, *fient*, *messun*, and *duddie*—all of which ought to have been explained for an English reader.

⁸ Burns's friend David Sillar published his *Poems* in 1789, at Kilmarnock. He too felt it necessary to include a glossary. The same thing

the case, would the poet have carefully explained the difference between the verbal forms in *-an* and *-in*?

One further suggestion in this connection: for the 1787 Edinburgh edition Burns, as is well known, deleted the old forms in *-an* and *-in*, substituting the more common ones in *-ing*. This is apparently another indication that the language of the 1786 volume was noticeably different from that commonly spoken in southern Scotland at the time of publication. It is doubtless stretching the point too far to compare Burns's choice of dialect with Lowell's use of the Yankee idiom in the *Biglow Papers*; yet the analogy is not utterly out of place. Something of the sort is what Burns did; at any rate he did not—as has been sometimes assumed—write his poems in a dialect which in all its details was familiar to and commonly used by his circle of friends and readers.⁹

II.

On the second question, whether or not Burns's use of dialect as a medium for poetry was in any way extraordinary or worthy of comment, there is a certain amount of evidence which may not be uninteresting. Part of it is drawn from the practice of his poetic contemporaries.

For instance, in 1775 there appeared a three-volume collection of "Poems, written chiefly by Scottish authors," entitled *The Caledoniad*, and having for its avowed purpose the laudable one of "preserving the capital Pieces of the best Scottish Poets."¹⁰ Here were printed a few old ballads, several selections by Dunbar, Henryson, Ramsay, and Fergusson, and a large number of poems by persons who apparently were writing at the time the collection was published. One hundred and seventy of these rather miscellaneous items are English, untainted by any suggestion of the vernacular; twenty-five are Scottish songs; only seven are vernacular poems other than songs. Clearly enough, if this collection can be taken as representative, the "best Scottish Poets" of 1775 wrote English.

is true of Andrew Shirrefs' *Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*, Edinburgh, 1790.

⁹ One remembers that virtually everything that Burns wrote in prose was English, with no suggestion of the vernacular.

¹⁰ *The Caledoniad* (London, 1775, 3 v.), I, ii.

Again, Michael Bruce (1746-1767), whose work Burns knew and esteemed, left behind him at his death a considerable body of verse.¹¹ Out of the mystery that still surrounds Bruce's work, one fact emerges unquestioned: nothing that he wrote, or that has been ascribed to him, is in Scots. To Bruce the use of the vernacular for poetry would not have seemed the normal mode of procedure.

Rather more interesting than the practise of Bruce is that of Dr. Thomas Blacklock (1721-1791), one of Burns's influential Edinburgh friends, a poet whose position was well established before Burns's success gave the cue to a flock of imitators, and most of whose poetry ante-dated Burns. Blacklock's collected poems were published two years after his death, and contain nothing that would even suggest the existence of a literary Scottish vernacular at that time.¹²

Again, one remembers the example of Gavin Turnbull, of whom Burns once wrote, "As he is an old friend of mine, I may be prejudiced in his favour; but I like some of his pieces very much."¹³ Turnbull's *Poetical Essays* appeared in 1788, divided into five sections: Elegies, Pastorals, Odes, Poetical Essays in the Scotch Dialect, and Songs. Of the five sorts of work here represented, only one was in the vernacular. My guess is that most of the volume was written before Burns's success made vernacular poetry popular, and that had Turnbull published before 1786 he too, like Bruce and Blacklock, would have written entirely in English.

Of course an argument based entirely on the failure of certain persons to write in Scots would be tenuous in the extreme. But there is other evidence pointing in the same direction, and tending to confirm my impression that Burns's use of dialect was more revolutionary than has usually been thought to be the case.

For instance, on October 6, 1808, Alexander Fraser Tytler, Lord Woodhouslee, wrote to John Mayne, acknowledging the

¹¹ The latest edition is *Poetical Works of Michael Bruce*, ed. William Stephen; Edinburgh, 1895.

¹² *Poems by the Late Reverend Dr. Thomas Blacklock*, Edinburgh, 1793. The handsome quarto seems to have been edited by Burns's friend Mackenzie, the "Man of Feeling," who wrote the biographical preface.

¹³ Letter to George Thomson, 29 October, 1793. In the Chambers-Wallace edition of Burns, iv, 56.

receipt of a copy of Mayne's *Siller Gun*. In the course of the letter he said, "You seem to me to have caught the true spirit of Burns, and show yourself a worthy successor to that admirable native genius who first rescued the poetry of his country and its perishing dialect from the neglect and oblivion to which they had been gradually sinking since the days of Allan Ramsay."¹⁴ Clearly enough Tytler believed that without Burns's example the vernacular, as a literary tongue, would have disappeared; that it had almost disappeared, when Burns "rescued" it. To him, Burns's choice of dialect may have seemed a stroke of genius; it must have seemed revolutionary. And Tytler was one of Burns's Edinburgh acquaintances, a man of wide reading and no inconsiderable literary talent, and so eager to further Burns's success that he assisted in reading the proofs of the 1793 Edinburgh edition.¹⁵

Again, during the last six years of Burns's life the indefatigable "agriculturalist" and statistician, Sir John Sinclair, was busy collecting materials for his compendious and invaluable *Statistical Account of Scotland*.¹⁶ A quarter of a century later, for the benefit of the general reader, he published a one-volume summary or condensation of the entire work, with certain historical matter added.¹⁷ Here appeared a brief comment on Burns: "In the work of Burns, we find displayed a most powerful natural genius, beautiful original ideas, and a deep insight into the human heart; though much of his merit is concealed by the provincial dialect, and quaint language in which he clothed them, or degraded by the unhappy disposition to vice, in which he indulged in his career of distinction."¹⁸ Here, then, was a native Scot, a contemporary of Burns, a man as familiar with conditions in Scotland as any person of his day, who deliberately called the language of Burns a "provincial dialect," and dubbed it "quaint."

It is true, of course, that by 1825 Sir John had become rather thoroughly Anglicized. I do not forget that at the out-

¹⁴ *The Siller Gun*, by John Mayne, London, 1836; p. ix.

¹⁵ See Burns's letter to Tytler, Chambers-Wallace edition, IV, 66.

¹⁶ Edinburgh, 1791-1799. 21 v.

¹⁷ *Analysis of the Statistical Account of Scotland*; Edinburgh, 1825.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 53. Parenthetically, the reference to "vice" shows how well-established was the Heron-Currie interpretation of Burns's character.

set of his prolific career as a writer he had published his *Observations on the Scottish Dialect*¹⁹ for the express purpose of helping his countrymen eradicate from their speech the Scotticisms from which Sinclair had struggled to free himself. Furthermore, his many years of service in Parliament, and his constant association with English governmental officials, had very probably diminished his memory of the years before the *Statistical Account* had made him famous. He may have been a prejudiced witness. But it is possible—I will state the matter conservatively—it is possible that Sinclair's opinion that the vernacular was only a quaint dialect, and had tended to conceal Burns's merits, would have been concurred in by other intelligent Scotsmen of the day. It is also conceivable that Burns's choice of the dialect seemed to Sinclair—and even to the poet himself—as something of a literary *tour-de-force*; a conscious attempt to re-establish as a literary language the already fading dialect in which Ramsay and Fergusson had done part of their work.

I have been trying to suggest that the dialect of Burns's first volume was not precisely the dialect in which he conversed with his Ayrshire friends and neighbors, and also that his use of a Scottish dialect for his poetry was a distinctly revolutionary proceeding. I would not press either point unduly. But before making a categorical denial of my suggestions the reader should at least consider a casual remark of the poet's brother Gilbert, made in 1798 in the course of a letter to Dr. Currie—a remark which bears upon both the matters I have been considering. "Among the earliest of [Burns's] poems," writes Gilbert, "was the *Epistle to Davie*. . . I was much pleased with the epistle, and said to him I was of opinion it would bear being printed, and that it would be well received by people of taste; that I thought it at least equal, if not superior, to many of Allan Ramsay's epistles, and that the merit of these, and much other Scotch poetry, seemed to consist principally in the knack of the expression, but here, there was a strain of interesting sentiment, and *the Scotticism of the language scarcely seemed affected, but appeared to be the natural language of the poet.*"²⁰ If this means anything at all,

¹⁹ London, 1782.

²⁰ *The Works of Robert Burns* [edited by Dr. James Currie], (fourth edition, London, 1803. 4 v.) III, 378 f. Italics mine.

and is not merely a sententious *ex-post-facto* comment on his brother's work, it means two things: first, that normally the use of "Scotticisms" in poetry would at that time and place have seemed an affectation, but that Burns wrote so well that virtually all traces of affectation disappeared from his work; and second, that the dialect of the poems was not the "natural language of the poet," but was made to appear so by the skill with which the poet handled it. And with this testimony from Gilbert Burns I am inclined to let the case rest.

FRANKLYN B. SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

JOHN SKELTON AND CHRISTOPHER GARNESCHE

When the Reverend Alexander Dyce published his edition of the "Poetical Works of John Skelton" in 1843, he printed for the first time four "Poems Against Garnesche." They were from a manuscript in the Harleian Collection 367 (fol. 101). In his introduction to the first volume of his edition, he gives a few facts gleaned from the Public Record Office about Garnesche, as well as a note in Hall's "Chronicles," and a letter from Lord Dacre to Henry VIII in which Garnesche is mentioned. In Volume II, Addenda, there are additional notices of Garnesche, among them the statement that he was the son of Edmund Garneys of Beccles, and a mention of his knighthood in 1513 by Henry VIII. No special study of these poems seems to have been made, however, although they are important in view of their biographical elements.

Researches in the "Letters and Papers of Henry VIII," reveal what it was not possible for Dyce to realize with the limited sources he had at hand—namely, the social and political importance of Garnesche. A study of the poems themselves is most misleading, because Skelton in his attack, whether conventional or sincere, tends to minimize and make light of any possible reputation Garnesche has attained. The interest in this court squabble, carried on "by the kynges most noble commandment," increases as we learn the status of the second person to the quarrel. But aside from its intrinsic interest, a study of the life of Garnesche enables us to date with a fair amount of accuracy these poems. "The Garlande

of Laurell " was printed in 1523 by Richard Faukes, the only poem for which we have a date. In it is recorded a list of other poems of Skelton, which can thus be dated as prior to 1523. This being only a definite date, at least a quarter of a century remains in which they might have been written. Therefore to narrow a group of poems to within two years of the date of writing is of more value in the study of Skelton than it would be of a man about whom more was known.

In the third poem against Garnesche, Skelton gives the following account of his early life:

Whan ye was yonger of age,
 Ye war a kechyn page,
 A dyshwasher, a dryvyll,
 In the pott your nose dedde sneuyll;
 Ye fryed and ye broyld,
 Ye rostyd and ye boylyd,
 Ye rostyd, like a fonne,
 A gose with the fete vponne;
 Ye slvfferd vp sowse
 In my lady Brewsys howse . . .¹

The impression Skelton means to give here is certainly that of lowly origin. In the first poem he speaks of Garnesche's pride:

Ye bere yow bolde as Barabas, or Syr Terry of Trace,²

and in the second

Pyramus, nor Priamus nor Syr Pyrrus the prowde,
 In Arturys auntyent actys no where ys prouyd your pere³

His purpose in the reviling of the first three poems is to show that Garnesche's airs and superiority are unwarranted; that he is really of humble origin and education in spite of his manner of a gentleman. But a study of Garnesche's family shows that his birth, while not noble, is not as humble as Skelton implies, nor was his position in the household that of a lowly born menial. As Dyce stated, Christopher was the son of Edmund Garneys of Beccles. The annals of Suffolk have much to say of the Garnesche or Garneys family, that being the commonest spelling of the name. They had been settled in Norfolk and Suffolk since the thirteenth century. Suckling, in his "History of the Antiquities of Suffolk"

¹ Dyce, I, 120.

² Dyce I, 116.

³ Dyce I, 119.

calls them "the ancient, once wealthy and wide spreading family of Garneys."⁴

The entire history of the family is given in "Suffolk Manorial Families, being the County Visitations and Other Pedigrees." The main family manors were Kenton, Redisham and Roos Hall. Kenton and Ross Hall were both in the possession of Peter Garneys, who died in 1451. Kenton passed to Thomas Garneys, and Roos Hall to Edmund, the father of Christopher. Consequently Christopher must have spent the early years of his life in a manor home of great beauty, according to the representation of it in Coppinger's "Manors of Suffolk."⁵ We know that Edmund Garneys, and presumably his family, were living there in 1470. There is an item in the "Calendar of Patent Rolls" for November, 1470:

The like (commission) to Thomas Brewse, Knight, John Hopton, Robert Hopton, Edmund Garneys . . . and the sheriff of Suffol to arrest T. Skidmore, Robert Russell, and Richard Hunton, and bring them before the king and council.

Consequently it is obvious that his very early surroundings were anything but lowly. His father was a member of one of the respected landed gentry of Suffolk, owner of a large manor house and its accompanying property. Skelton's assertion is that he was a kitchen page in the household of Lady Brewse. The statement is doubtless perfectly true, but it only tells half the truth. The whole truth was that he was sent, as was the custom, to the home of a rich neighbor, there to be educated in the ways of a gentleman. The custom was, of course, usual from the highest nobility to the gentry. Such apprenticeship implied no inferiority of rank. It was not as the son of a yeoman, or as a humble servant, that he became part of the Brewse family. His duties were doubtless menial, but no more so than those done in their boyhood by men of higher rank, during such an apprenticeship.

It is further possible to identify almost certainly the exact branch of the Brewse family he served. There were two main branches of the family, one living at Hasketon Hall, the other at Little Wenham. The Brewses had had a title for two centuries. The line had descended directly from Sir Richard Brewse, who died in 1323, to Sir Thomas Brewse, who died in 1482. According to his will, dated

⁴ Suckling I, 63.

⁵ Coppinger, VII, 159.

July 10, 1479, the manor passed to his widow for life and on her death to his son and heir, William Brewse. The reference to Lady Brewse rather than Sir Thomas would seem to imply this period, which must have been very near the year 1482. William Brewse died in 1489, and at some time in this period he came into possession of the manor. The use of the title *Lady* makes it certain that this was the branch of the family referred to, because the title only existed in the line of the eldest son. The evidence thus points to its being the family of Sir Thomas Brewse, at Hasketon Hall, with whom Garnesche lived. The reference given above shows that Sir Thomas and Edmund Garneys were associated as members of a commission.

The replies of Garnesche to Skelton have never been found. But we may assume that between the third and fourth poem, Garnesche sent Skelton some such statement of his birth and education as we have given here, and with a disparagement of Skelton's own antecedents. In the fourth poem Skelton says:

Dysparage ye myn auncetry?
 Ye ar dysposed for to ly: . . .
 Thow claimist the jentyll, thow art a curre;
 Haroldis they know thy cote armur:
 Thow thou be a jantyll man borne,
 Yet jantylnes in the ys thred bare worne.*

A certain grudging concession he must make here to what he cannot deny, but he minimizes his concession by refusing to admit that Garnesche acts as befits a gentleman.

In the third poem, he says of Garnesche's youth:

At Gynys when ye ware
 But a slender spere,
 Dekkyd lewdly in your gere. . . .†

I am unable to find what Garnesche's early connections were in France. After 1519 he spent most of his life as an official in Calais, to which Guines is so near as to be originally a part. The records of the reign of Henry VII being what they are, it is impossible to trace the career of Garnesche with much success (Dyce gives one notice before 1509) until he appears in the State Papers in the

* Dyce i, 128.

† Dyce i, 121.

year 1509. There is no record of him at either Cambridge or Oxford. In 1509 he appears as "Gentleman Usher":

For Christopher Garneys, gentleman usher of the chamber, Annuity of 10. l. during pleasure.⁸

There are several other items through the early years, but the important one comes in 1513. Grant 4468 reads:

Knights made at Tourayne in the church, after the king came from Mass, under his banner in the church 25 December,⁹ fifth year of the reign.
. . . . Sir Christopher Cairreys.

This grant is in the British Museum, and is not a contemporaneous copy. This probably accounts for the discrepancy in dates, because Hall gives the date of the knighting as October second:

Then the kinge called to his presence Edwarde Guldeforde, William Fitzwilliam . . . and Christopher Garnishe, and divers other valient esquiers, and gave to them the order of knighthood. . . .¹⁰

Plainly, Skelton's poems were written just after this event in 1513. In the first poem the entire emphasis is on knighthood. Just to take a few lines from the six stanzas that repeat the same thing:

But if it was Syr Tyrmagent that tyrnyd without nall,
For Sir Frollo de Franko was never half so tall.
But seye now, Syr Satrapas, what autoryte ye haue
In your chalenge, Syr Chysten, to cale me a knaue? ¹¹

In the second he again stresses the knighthood, implying that it has made Garnesche prouder than all the famous knights in history:

Syr Guy, Syr Gawen, Syr Cayus, for and Syr Olyuere,
Pyramus nor Priamus, nor Syr Pyrrus the prowde,
In Arturys auneyent actys no where is propuyd your pere. . . .¹²

This sort of jibing would have little point if Garnesche had been a knight for any length of time. It is recent enough to make references to it pertinent; hence the first poems, at least, are not later than 1514.

I have one more suggestion to offer in regard to Garnesche. In

⁸ *Letters and Papers*, I, 76.

⁹ P. 876.

¹⁰ Hall, p. 566.

¹¹ Dyce, 116.

¹² Dyce, 119.

the fourth poem, line 164, Skelton calls Garnesche "Ye Haruy Haftar:"

Harkyn herte, ye Haruy Haftar,
Pride gothe before and schame commyth after.¹³

The New English Dictionary records the first use of "Haftar," meaning "wily," as in the "Vulgaria" of Hormanni, 1519. Apparently it was not in common usage, even granting that it was not original with Skelton. Moreover, its use in combination with "Haruy" is, as far as I have been able to find out, original with him. The significance of its use is, of course, in connection with the "Bowge of Court." A very interesting hypothesis was suggested by Brie in "Skelton-Studien," *Englische Studien*, that Skelton's removal from the court to Diss in 1504 was connected with such dissatisfaction with courtly life as expressed in the "Bowge." Does the "Bowge" reflect the actual situation at the court, and have the characters possible prototypes in real men? Certainly the possibility that behind *Haruy Haftar* we have some court figure like Garnesche is worth consideration.

HELEN STEARNS.

New Haven, Connecticut.

BARONESS KNORRING'S *THE PEASANT AND HIS LANDLORD*

The other day while examining the list of reviews and translations of *German Literature in American Magazines* [from] 1846 to 1880¹ by Martin Henry Haertel, I came upon² the entry of "Baroness Knorring. The Peasant and his Landlord." Dr. Haertel had found and listed three reviews of this novel—in the *Christian Examiner*, the *Democratic Review*, and in the *Literary World* (New York)—all of the year 1848. This is an interesting error or oversight.

Whether or not Mr. Haertel examined these reviews—it is obvious that he never investigated the work itself—he never discovered

¹³ Dyce I, 120.

¹ *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 263, Madison, 1908.

² Pp. 102, 103, and 182.

that the author of *The Peasant and his Landlord* was not a German writer at all. "Knorring" is not an exclusively German name, though we might call it a Germanic one. There were curiously enough two novelists in the Germanic North who could boast of being "Baroness Knorring" and, what is still more curious, of being "Baroness Sophia (or Sophie) von Knorring." One was Sophie Tieck, a sister of Ludwig Tieck, who in her second matrimonial venture married a Baron von Knorring. According to the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (article on Tieck), she had for example written a novel, *Evremond*, for which her brother Ludwig had written the introduction. She died in 1833. Quite naturally Haertel believed, if indeed he knew of her at all, that she was the author of the above item, which is however not the case.

The author of *The Peasant and his Landlord* was another, Sophia von Knorring, a Swedish novelist, born Zelow, who first became known in 1834, the year after the death of her German namesake, through her novel *Kusinerna*. In 1843 she published *Torparen och hans omgivning* (literally, "The Crofter and his Environment") which her English translator, Mary Howitt, rendered freely by the above title. Incidentally, there is a country squire in the novel, whom we may call a "landlord," who constitutes the villain in the hero's human surroundings; so that the title is quite suited to the work, in fact, more suited than that of the original, which might easily be taken for an essay dealing with the economic, social and agricultural position of the peasant.

It will be observed that the original of *The Peasant and his Landlord* was not written until ten years after the death of the German Sophie von Knorring. The English translation appeared simultaneously in England and America, in 1848, the year of death of the Swedish Baroness von Knorring, and was published by R. Bentley (London) and Harper and Brothers (New York), respectively. The Congressional Library card for the American edition indicates, in brackets, that it was translated "from the Swedish," although there is no information about the matter on the title-page of the book. An examination of the Translator's Preface to the volume, however, points at once to the "Northern" nationality of the author; and anyone acquainted with Mary Howitt's numerous renderings from the Scandinavian writers would first of all look around in Sweden and Denmark for the original of her trans-

lations, even though in the beginning of her translation career she more often than not used a German version of the Swedish or Danish product. This was certainly true of some of her translations of the Swedish novelist, Fredrika Bremer.

Mrs. Howitt's preface to *The Peasant and his Landlord* follows:

"It is with great pleasure that I introduce to the English public another new Northern Author, well worthy to take her place beside Fredrika Bremer and Hans Christian Andersen. In her own country the Baroness Knorring stands side by side with the Author of "The Home" and "The Neighbors," and I feel sure that the peculiar excellence and originality of her writings will be equally acknowledged in this [England], when once they are made known to the public."

Mrs. Howitt was in 1848 well known as the translator of Fredrika Bremer's novels, *The Home* and *The Neighbors*, and assumed perhaps that a mention of her works in the same sentence with Baroness Knorring would be sufficient to designate by inference the nationality of the latter. Besides, the German Baroness Knorring had by this time been dead for fifteen years, and it is not likely that she was still well remembered outside her own native land. It is extremely doubtful indeed whether Mary Howitt had ever heard of her, whereas she took special pains to study and translate the Swedish and Danish writers.

ADOLPH B. BENSON.

Yale University.

HEINRICH HEINES BRIEFWECHSEL BY FRIEDRICH HIRTH

A NOTE AND A WARNING

Hirth's work of three volumes is unquestionably of a high order and of inestimable value to the *Heine-Forschung*. Yet this stream of information is not free from treacherous shoals, doubly treacherous because, on the whole, that stream is so steady, deep, and dependable.

As a warning may serve the following instance: Hirth says (I, 136): ". . . Zwei erhaltene Briefe Rahels rechtfertigen ihren Abdruck ebenso wie solche Immermanns, Gaudys, Victor Hugos,

Alexander Dumas, der George Sand u. s. w. Alle wurden wortgetreu in der Orthographie der Schreiber zum Abdruck gebracht, . . ." This statement may be true as regards letters No. 375 (Victor Hugo), No. 596 und No. 728 (George Sand), No. 418 (Dumas), for they are in French, but the short excerpt given under No. 1016 (Dumas) is in German, and it is quite certain that Dumas knew no German, even if one does not take his own statement to that effect seriously (in: *Celebrated Crimes*, transl. by I. G. Burnham, Philadelphia [1895]; III, Karl Ludwig Sand, p. 145).

The situation is different in the case of Gérard de Nerval (letter No. 540). He knew German, he knew considerable German and loved it, and knew more than Heine gives him credit for in the Introduction to his *Poèmes et Légendes* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1900, p. vii). This letter of Gérard de Nerval was written in Bruxelles upon his return from Vienna and other German speaking cities and while he was working on the translation of Heine's *Lieder*. Hirth's letter seems to be complete, for it has beginning and end, and a postscript to boot. The authorities on Gérard de Nerval have only a third of it: Julia Cartier, *Un Intermédiaire entre la France et l'Allemagne, Gérard de Nerval*, Genève 1904, p. 77; Aristide Marie, *Gérard de Nerval*, Paris 1914, p. 236; Jules Marsan, *La Correspondance, 1830-1855*, of Gérard de Nerval, Paris 1911, p. 102-3. As a matter of fact, the latter two content themselves with referring to Julia Cartier and reprinting her short passage. I was about to believe that Hirth's full text was the original on account of its completeness, Hirth's expressed statement quoted above, and his acknowledgment of indebtedness for generous help to various French libraries, "vor allem aber dem Mitgliede der französischen Akademie, S. Reinach, der voll teilnehmendsten Interesses mir in Paris und einigen anderen Städten Frankreichs viele Wege ebnete und manche Türe öffnete (I, 225-26)." I was ready to make this letter the basis for an examination of Gérard de Nerval's knowledge of German, when it seemed safer, first to find out in which language it really was written. Since this document is part of the collection Spoelberch de Lovenjoul, in the keeping of the Institut de France, inquiry was made of its custodian, M. Marcel Bouteron. This query brought forth the prompt and courteous reply that the letter in question (Ms. 704,

fol. 28-29) is in French, and by the various citations on the part of M. Bouteron it is evident that Hirth's letter is quite complete, only unfortunately not in the original language.

To be sure, the three volumes of Hirth were to be supplemented by a fourth with *Kommentar, Register, Verzeichnis der Adressaten, vor Allem aber Nachtrage und Berichtigungen* (III, p. ix), but it seems unlikely that it will be published for some time, if ever. Volumes I and II were published 1914 and 1917 respectively by Georg Müller, a man who held a unique position among the ambitious and courageous publishers of Germany, but who is said to have been so forgetful that at one time he contracted twice for a Heine edition of 25 volumes, and that at another time he paid an author an indemnity rather than print his book for which he had signed a contract—only to find that very book a few weeks later, printed and bound, but forgotten, in a corner of his store-rooms (*Lit. Welt*, 3. Feb. 1928, S. 4). But Georg Müller died in 1917. After his death his work fell into various hands. Ullstein, Berlin, took over the *Klassiker-Ausgaben* under the name of *Der Propyläen-Verlag*, and here appeared volume III of Hirth's edition in the year 1920. In view of these complications and uncertainties this note of warning may be justified and prove helpful.

FRANZ SCHNEIDER.

University of California, Berkeley.

OE. *mæzeþ* IN HALI MEIDENHAD

In lines 3 and 4 of the homily *Hali Meidenhad*¹ appears this passage:

euch meiden þat² haueð meidene þeawes. . . . (Titus text)

euch meiden þet² haueð meiið þeawes. . . . (Bodley text)

each maiden that has maidens³ virtues. . . . (Furnivall's translation)

What is *meiið*, in the Bodley text?

¹ *Hali Meidenhad. An Alliterative Homily of the Thirteenth Century.* From MS Bodley 34, Oxford, and Cotton MS Titus D. 18, British Museum. Ed. Furnivall. E. E. T. S., 1922 (for 1920). O. S. 18 revised.

² Italics as in the edition.

³ Printed without apostrophe.

Modern English *maid* is the first word that comes to mind; the confusion of *d* with *ð* is not unusual in ME. But the NED. explains *maid* as a late apocopated form of *maiden*, from OE. *mæȝden*, and gives no example before Skelton and Dunbar of forms without final *-e* (ME. *meide*, *maide*). Further, the syntax of the passage requires that *meið* be genitive, and only among the minor consonantal declensions, even in OE., do we find genitives without endings; nor do we expect a new word to join a moribund declension.

The next possibility is OE. *mæȝð*, meaning 'family,' 'race,' or 'tribe.' This might fit the context. But it does not parallel in meaning *meidene* of the Titus text; it belongs to the strong feminine declension; and at about the time of our text it was inflected in the singular, witness of *Assæress mæȝþe*, *Ormulum*, 7678. *May*, OE. *mæȝ*, lacks the final *ð*. The only other possibility would seem to be OE. *mæȝeþ* or *mæȝþ*, one of the four nouns of the þ-stem declension; and this, I believe, is the correct etymon. With reference to the þ-stem declension in ME. the Wrights express current opinion as follows:

Of the four OE. nouns belonging to this type only two were preserved in ME, viz. *mōneþ* (OE. *mōnaþ*), and *āle*, *ale* (OE. *ealu*, gen and dat. *ealoþ*)⁴

But the word in question, since Cockayne by chance did not include it in the apparatus of his 1866 edition, had not appeared outside the MS. till the present edition (1922), and was presumably unknown to the grammarians. OE. *mæȝeþ* was uninflected in the singular; the next line of the homily shows in each text another survival of an uninflected genitive singular, *fulher* (OE. *fader*, *feader*). Then if the phonology can be satisfactorily explained, we may safely add *meið* to the meager list of þ-stems surviving the Conquest.

In reference to the phonology of *meið* < OE. *mæȝ(e)þ* there are two points to consider: (1) the diphthong *ei*, (2) the post-tonic *i*.

(1) OE *æȝ* is usually represented in eME by *ai*, and is thus distinguished from *ei* < OE *-eȝ*. In the Bodley MS. of the present text, however, *ei* is normally used for the sound growing out of

⁴ J. and E. M. Wright, *An Elementary Middle English Grammar* (Oxford, 1923), 142.

OE. *æ3*. In the first hundred lines, for example, the following instances occur: *mei*, ll. 66, 67; *meiden*, ll. 3, 44; *meiðhad*, l. 28; *seide*, l. 49. On p. 14, again, seven times the Bodley text contains *meiðhad* vs. *meidenhad* in the Titus text; note the almost invariable spelling with *ei*, as well as the Bodley scribe's propensity for the descendant of *mæ3eþ* in derivatives.

(2) The posttonic *i* may be a scribal error comparable to the irrational *i* in *cleainnesse*, Bodley l. 144; it may be an indication that the word could still be dissyllabic, representing the posttonic *e* of OE. *mæ3eþ* palatalised by the frontal *3*, or perhaps in keeping with the tendency of the scribe to use *i* for *e* in inflectional endings, e. g. *bittri* (for *bittre*?) Bodley l. 21, *chaungin*, *passið*, *seruin*, etc. (see Glossary).

In form, then, ME. *meið* seems to be derived from OE. *mæ3eþ*; and would represent the uninflected genitive singular of a þ-stem. *Meidene* of the Titus text is of course genitive plural (OE. *Mæ3dena*), and to this extent gen. sg. *meið* is not quite parallel. But either singular or plural makes equally good sense, 'a maiden's virtues' or 'maidens' virtues.'

WENDELL F. FOGG.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

OLD FRENCH CRESTANGE (—NIE?) BODEL AND BODEL SACELIER

Raschi explains the Aramaic *sanía dibi*, the name of a part of the intestines of an ox, by *crestange* (or *-nie*?) *bodel*, or *bodel crestange* (*-nie*?). He says of this part, "It has the form of a purse and is closed at its top."¹ Again Raschi cites from the Talmudic dictionary of Rabbi Makhir, the brother of R. Gershom of Metz and Mayence (ca. 950-ca. 1028)² the expression *bodel sacelier* as a translation of *sanía dibi*.³ Now a text-book of anatomy informs us that at the point where the colon, the first division of the

¹ *Houl.* 50b. and 58b.

² Gross, Henri, *Gallia Judaica, dictionnaire géographique de la France*, (Paris, 1897), p. 299.

³ *Houl.* 56. I am indebted to Dr. D. S. Blondheim for this and other information as well as for suggesting the subject of this article.

great intestine of an ox, leaves the small intestine, "il y a . . . tantôt deux caecum, tantôt un seul. Ce caecum est la partie la plus variable du gros intestin."⁴ It would seem probable then that Raschi, when he referred to a purse-shaped thing, meant the caecum. The form *sacelier* could come from the Latin *saccellarius*, a derivate of *sacculus*, itself a diminutive of *saccus*, "bag." *Saccellarius* in the sense of "treasurer" existed as early as the time of Gregory the Great (ca. 540-604), and was common in mediaeval Latin (cf. Forcellini-De Vit, s. v.; *Corp. gloss. lat.*, VII, s. v.; Du Cange, *saccus*, IV). S. v. *sachel* Godefroy cites the following example:

L'abbé portout reliques
Entur sun col en un *sachel*,
Asceme ne fu weres ne bel.

Chardry, *Josap.*, 1268, Koch.⁵

In the surgical treatise of Henri de Mondeville we find the following passage, "Le 4. bouel qui est continué o yleon est apelé *sac*, ou *orobus*, ou cil qui n'a qu'un oil . . ."⁶ The editor of the text defines *orobus* in his glossary as "probablement corruption d'*orbus*, caecum, nom de la première partie du gros intestin."⁷ The fact that *sac*, a word closely related to *sacelier* means "caecum," supports the view that the caecum is the part that Raschi meant. It is also of interest to note that the *New English Dictionary*, s. v. *budget*,⁷ gives the following: "The blinde gut . . . is commonly called by some the *sacke* or budget gut." 1594 T. B. La Primaud. *Fr. Acad.* II, 350.⁸ This offers an additional illustration of the use of the word *sacke* applied to the caecum.

⁴ Gegenbaur, C., *Manuel d'anatomie comparée, traduit en français sous la direction de Carl Vogt* (Paris 1874), p. 755.

⁵ The example of *saceaus* cited by Godefroy from the *Rose*, "ms. Brux. folio 62b," reads in the edition of E. Langlois, *Roman de la Rose, Société des anciens textes français*, II (Paris, 1920), 3401, *caseaus*. "booths." However, Godefroy gives the same quotation correctly under *caseau*.

⁶ Bos, A., ed., *La Chirurgie de Maître Henri de Mondeville, Société des anciens textes français*, I (Paris, 1897), p. 102, sect. 371.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, p. 307. Cotgrave (1632) lists, s. v. *sac*, the meaning, "as Intestin borgne," which he defines "*The blind gut*."

⁸ Pierre de La Primaudaye was a member of one the important Protestant families of Anjou, and served at the court under both Henri III and Henri IV. He was the author of *L'Académie françoise* (Paris, 1577) and of *Suite de l'académie françoise* (Paris, 1580), both of which went through

Further investigation revealed what is believed to be the explanation of the phrase *crestange* (-nie?) *bodel*, and also of Raschi's meaning when he said that the intestine indicated was "closed at the top." Sisson says, "The first part of the colon is marked off from the caecum only by the ilio-caecal opening."⁹ He also says, "The end of the ileum is partially telescoped into the caecum, so that the orifice is surrounded by a fold of mucous membrane, forming the ilio-caecal valve,"¹⁰ and enclosing a thick muscular layer which forms a mound-shaped projection above the surrounding surface. This projection perhaps suggested the name *crestange* (-nie?), "crested." Cf. the Old French *cresté* "qui porte une crête," cited by Godefroy.¹¹

LULA M. RICHARDSON.

Wells College.

LE TEMPS EST UN SONGE ET L'INTERSIGNE DE VILLIERS

La puissance d'une imagination, d'un rêve,
d'une vision, dépasse quelquefois les
lois de la vie.

—Villiers de l'Isle Adam

Dans une étude précédente¹ j'ai déjà indiqué quelques traits communs à M. Lenormand et à Villiers de l'Isle Adam. S'il semble futile de vouloir donner celui-ci comme source possible de l'inspiration de celui-là, il peut du moins être intéressant de rapprocher deux esprits qui offrent des ressemblances parfois frappantes. Je voudrais attirer l'attention sur l'analogie qui me semble exister entre *Le Temps est un songe* de M. Lenormand et l'un des contes les plus dramatiques de Villiers, *l'Intersigne*.

several editions and were translated into English. (Cf. Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale* (Paris, 1867) and the *Catalogue of the British Museum*). It seems probable that Cotgrave's information as to *sac* (n., above) was derived from a perusal of La Primaudaye.

⁹ Sisson, S., *A Text-book of Veterinary Anatomy* (Philadelphia and London, 1910), p. 398.

¹⁰ Sisson, S., *The Anatomy of the Domestic Animals* (Philadelphia, 1917), p. 365.

¹¹ S. v. *orester*.

¹ "Le Mal moyen dramatique chez M. Lenormand," *R. R.*, xix (1928), 3.

Dans le conte de Villiers un jeune officier Xavier de la V . . . arrive en Bretagne pour voir un ami très cher l'abbé M. . . qu'il n'a pas vu depuis de longues années. Le jeune homme est de tempérament nerveux et d'une grande sensibilité psychique. En arrivant il contemple la cure paisible qui respire le recueillement. S'étant retourné pour regarder la forêt qui flambe au soleil couchant, il voit la maison de l'abbé tout autre. Toute beauté et toute vie y ont disparu et il n'y peut plus distinguer que la mort qui menace les choses. L'abbé l'accueille avec joie, c'est un homme svelte mais d'apparence vigoureuse, lorsqu'un peu plus tard il conduit son ami à sa chambre, il lui apparaît d'une pâleur mortelle et revêtu de solennité comme un mort. Xavier de la V . . . s'assoupit au milieu de la nuit lorsque trois coups sont frappés à sa porte. Il se lève, ou croit se lever, en réalité nous ne savons pas. La lune éclaire la chambre. La porte s'ouvre et il voit le prêtre debout, le tricorne sur la tête et dans sa figure il ne peut distinguer que les yeux qui le regardent avec une solennité fixe. Paralysé par la terreur, le jeune homme reste immobile tandis que le prêtre élevant lentement le bras lui tend un long manteau de voyage. Entre eux deux passe un oiseau de nuit avec un cri affreux. Alors le jeune officier repousse la porte et donne un coup de clef. Il s'éveille, mais il constate que la lune éclaire la chambre et qu'à la porte un coup de clef en dedans a été donné. Le lendemain il veut raconter au prêtre sa vision. Mais au moment où il arrive au geste qui offrait le manteau on lui apporte une lettre qui le rappelle immédiatement à Paris. Ainsi il ne continue pas son récit et ne dit pas le geste, ce qui peut-être eût arrêté la catastrophe en prévenant l'abbé, si toutefois on peut arrêter une chose qui pré-existe. Le prêtre insiste pour accompagner son ami un bout de chemin et tandis qu'il marche, une bruine froide et pénétrante se met à tomber; Xavier voudrait renvoyer l'abbé à son presbytère. Le prêtre alors dégrafe son manteau et le lui tend du geste que le jeune homme lui avait vu faire dans la nuit. Alors la lune les baigne spontanément de sa lumière pâle; un aigre cri d'oiseau se fait entendre: le décor est pareil au décor de la vision. Et tandis que l'abbé lui tend le manteau, le jeune officier ne peut voir sa figure mais seulement ses yeux qui le considèrent avec une solennelle fixité. Immobile, reconnaissant tous les détails, il se sent impuissant à arrêter le geste du prêtre qui agrafe le manteau et il saute à cheval pour fuir la mort qu'il a sentie passer. Quelques jours après il apprend que l'abbé est mort d'un froid gagné sur le grand chemin.

Dans *Le Temps est un songe*, un jeune homme Nico, revient en Hollande, après de longues années passées à Java. C'est un homme miné par la vie des tropiques, d'une sensibilité excessive et adonné aux spéculations métaphysiques. Romée, sa fiancée, en venant chez lui et avant de l'avoir revu, a une vision vers laquelle tendra ensuite tout le drame, qui attirera les événements, les pensées et les personnages jusqu'à ce que tout soit conforme au tableau offert tout d'abord à Romée. Sur le chemin qui suit le bord de l'eau, Romée voit s'estomper le paysage familier, tandis que tout devient sans vie, tranquille et désagréable. Pourtant elle demeure

lucide et distingue qu'on a coupé les roseaux et qu'il y a une barque verte. Puis dans le brouillard qui enveloppe l'étang elle voit tout à coup une tête d'homme dont elle distingue nettement les traits, et cet homme est en train de se noyer. Or Romée ne peut appeler au secours, car elle sent que cela ne servirait à rien. Lorsqu'elle revoit Nico, elle reconnaît en lui trait pour trait la face de l'homme qui dans sa vision se noya dans l'étang. Elle a pris la résolution de ne rien découvrir à Nico, mais imprudemment ou fatalement elle lui découvre un jour la partie la plus tragique de cette vision. Et il semble que ceci fasse naître dans l'esprit de Nico les actions ou les gestes qui le mèneront vers le suicide. Ainsi comme l'officier du conte de Villiers, la jeune fille est la cause involontaire et pourtant consciente de la mort d'un être qu'elle chérit. Toute une saison se traîne et Romée reprend espoir, mais Nico devient plus indifférent à la vie comme si le gagnait peu à peu l'idée de la mort inévitable. On sent le danger imminent lorsque Nico donne l'ordre de couper les roseaux : il prépare le paysage de la catastrophe. Sa soeur, Riemke, veut l'entraîner à un mariage ami, après quoi elle le fera embarquer pour Java et ils sont partis pour la gare. Mais Romée voit arriver dans le décor aux roseaux coupés une barque verte qu'a commandée Nico. Le décor est tout prêt lorsque s'élève une brume assez dense. Alors Nico revient, sa soeur s'étant trouvée mal à la gare, et il marche droit vers le décor tragique d'où il ne reviendra pas.

Il est sans doute vrai que la situation est plus compliquée et plus tragique dans la pièce de M. Lenormand parce qu'il y a lutte, lutte qui n'ose se découvrir de la part des deux femmes qui voudraient soustraire Nico à l'ambiance mauvaise. C'est la lutte de l'amour contre la destinée ; et la destinée est la plus forte. La situation est plus compliquée parce qu'on sent grandir chez Nico la faim de la mort qui sera peut-être l'apaisement des spéculations sans fin, peut-être une réponse aux questions humaines. Cette faim grandit par l'influence délétère d'un climat humide chez un homme qui vient des pays du soleil où la grande chaleur incline à l'oubli. Malgré cela il m'a paru intéressant de rapprocher deux situations dont les correspondances m'ont frappé et qui révèlent à des années de distance une analogie d'esprits pour qui vraiment "l'idée est la plus haute forme de la réalité."

ADOLPHE-JACQUES DICKMAN.

State University of Iowa.

AN IRISH PARALLEL TO THE BROKEN SWORD OF THE GRAIL CASTLE

In "Caeilte's Visit to Assaroe," an episode of the Irish *Acal-lamh na Senórach*, numerous particulars, including a broken sword, remind the reader of Perceval's visit to the Grail Castle.¹

Caeilte's Visit to Assaroe

Caeilte goes to Bé-bind to be cured of a wound. Bé-bind has the Tuatha dé Danann's draught of leechdom and healing, and all that remains of Goibniu's ale. On the way, he and his companion, Cass Corach, stop at an elf-mound. Fer maisse (beautiful man), "a youth clad in a green mantle with a brooch of gold therein, and on his head a golden diadem," invites them to enter. The invitation is seconded by Fergus Fairhair, son of the Dagda.

Fergus tells Caeilte that he has a sword-hilt which he wishes Caeilte to repair, for the Tuatha dé Danann have refused to do it. Caeilte spends the whole day repairing it and at night gives it complete to Fergus. Then Caeilte repairs a spear and a javelin.

Each weapon is destined to kill someone: the sword will kill Bé dreacain (woman dragon), the daughter of Herod, who carries off jewels and treasures from the elf-mounds; the spear will kill Garb, son of Tarb, King of Norway; the javelin will kill "one of the two kings of the world, or of Norway, or of Erin." Caeilte says that it is fated that he shall do some deed for which the men of Erin and of Alba and the Tuatha dé Danann will be thankful. He asks for and obtains the spear.

After staying three days and three nights with the fairy folk, Caeilte and Cass Corach leave. Fer maisse accompanies them.

The three find Bé-bind, who comes, surrounded by her thrice fifty fair women, to welcome them. While they are at Assaroe, the vast army of Bé-dreacain and the King of Norway, lands.² Caeilte slays the King of Norway; Cass Corach, Bé dreacain; and Fer maisse, Eolus. When these three have fallen, the fleet goes home.

Perceval's Visit to the Grail Castle

Perceval, who is seeking his mother's home, chances upon the Grail Castle, into which he is invited by the Fisher King. There he is given a sword, which, he is told, will fail him at need. The sword is judged and

¹ Parallels to the Grail, Lance, and Sword of the Grail Castle have been pointed out, but no one has hitherto found anything like the broken sword which the hero must repair.

² To this point, I have summarized from Wh. Stokes's tr. in *Irische Texte*, series 4, I, 254-58; (Irish text lines 6789-6918, from MS. Laud

destined for him.³ In the account of Chrétien's continuator, Wauchier, Perceval is asked to mend a broken sword. He is successful except for leaving a slight mark of the old break.⁴ When Perceval, in Chrétien's account, leaves the castle, he is met by a maiden who knows all about him, the sword, the Grail Castle, and the Fisher King—who is, in fact, niece to the Fisher King, cousin to Perceval, and who may be said to be a member of the strange court which he has just left.⁵ With the sword, which Perceval takes with him, the death of the Fisher King's brother must be avenged. Perceval, according to Menessier, accomplishes this by killing Partinel.⁶

The two stories differ, of course, in many respects. Yet no one could read the two, I think, without feeling that they were basically the same. They have these points in common: (1) A warrior whose destination is a place beyond, happens upon a marvellous dwelling. (In the Irish story, the dwelling is owned by the Dagda, King of the Tuatha dé Danann, a fairy folk.) (2) The visiting warrior is given a test of repairing a broken sword. (3) The purpose of the test is unknown to the hero.⁷ (4) The visitor is met by a man of the fairy household and is invited to enter. (5) The hero is the destined one.⁸ (6) Vengeance is the motive.

610). For the conclusion, one must consult *Silva Gadelica*, II, 247-49, tr. by S. H. O'Grady; Irish text I, 218-19. The *Acallamh* exists in 15th century MSS., but was composed about 1200 (Thurneysen, *Heldensage*, 48). It seems to be uninfluenced by French Arthurian romances.

³ Summarized from *Perceval le Gallois ou Le Conte du Graal*, ed. by Ch. Potvin, 1866-72. The first visit occurs in Chrétien's part; subsequent visits described by Chrétien's continuators complete the story, though they are in the main but retellings. The summary to this point is from vv. 4172-4346.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 34870-34899.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 4547-4777.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 44574-44578.

⁷ "And knowest thou, Cailte, my soul, our real reason for repairing that sword?' 'Truly, I know not,' says Cailte."—Stokes, 255. Perceval is, under one form of test or another, always unknown, in each of his Grail Castle visits. It is a common motif in fairy stories: cf. *Die Heilung der Morrigan*, tr. by Windisch in *Die Altirische Heldensage Táin Bó Cúalnge* nach dem Buch von Leinster . . . *Irische Texte*, extra band 330-34, and Kittredge's discussion of this point in his *Study of Gawain and the Green Knight*, pp. 79-80. Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance* . . . , I, 250, note, says that "This feature of the Grail Story, is undoubtedly, of folk-lore origin."

⁸ "It was my fate,' says Cailte, 'to do some deed for which the men

" . . . Biaux frère, ceste espée

Vous fu jugie et destinée;—Potvin, 4345-4346.

(7) After the visiting warrior has left, help is given to him by a member of the fairy household: Fer maisse helps Caeilte; the niece of the Fisher King helps Perceval.

These two episodes, then, "Caeilte's Visit to Assaroe" and Perceval's visit to the Grail Castle, seem to belong with other bits of evidence which tend to prove a Celtic origin for much of the French Arthurian romance material.

WALTER PENNINGTON.

Northwestern University.

AN HOLY JEWES SHEPE

Chaucer's Pardoner, in his prolog, says that among other relics

Than have I in latoun a sholder-boon

Which that was of an holy Jewes shepe.

(*Cant. Tales*, C 350-351.)

The only explanation of this passage I have seen in Skeat's; he says that the sheep was perhaps Jacob's, and he gives references to conjuring by sheeps' shoulder bones. But this does not explain why the sheep was owned by a holy Jew. Might not that holy Jew be Gideon, whose miracle-working fleece and whose subsequent exploits and prosperity are told of in Judges vi? Gideon's fleece drew water from heaven; the miracles wrought by the shoulder bone of a sheep, as described by the Pardoner, were watery ones; the power of any sheep's shoulder bone added to that of such a sheep as Gideon's might well be as great as the Pardoner claims. And according to the account in the book of Judges, Gideon was surely a holy Jew.

G. M. RUTTER.

Western Reserve University.

of Erin and Alba and the Tuatha dé Danann would be thankful. I did not in my youth. Who knows but that my fate is that I should do it today?'—Stokes, 256.

JEFFERSON AND OSSIAN

Readers of M. Chinard's article on Jefferson and Ossian in *MLN.*, xxxviii (1923), 201-5, will be interested in an excerpt from the travel writings¹ of the Marquis de Chastellux, who visited Jefferson at Monticello in 1782. Jefferson's own words, in the first letter that M. Chinard quotes, "These peices [*sic*] have been and will be to me the source of daily and exalted pleasures" are beautifully illustrated by the remarks of the Marquis:

Je me rappelle avec plaisir, qu'un soir, comme nous étions à causer autour d'un *bowl* de *punch*, après que Madame Jefferson s'étoit retirée, nous vîmes à parler des poésies d'*Oscian*. Ce fut une étincelle d'électricité qui passa rapidement de l'un à l'autre: nous nous rappellions les passages de ces sublimes poésies qui nous avoient le plus frappés, & nous en entretenions mes compagnons de voyage, qui heureusement savoient très bien l'anglois & étoient en état de les apprécier, mais qui ne les avoient jamais lues. Bientôt on voulut que le livre eût part à la *toast*: on alla le chercher, il fut placé près du bowl de *punch*, & l'un & l'autre nous avoient déjà conduits assez loin dans la nuit, avant que nous nous en fussions aperçus. D'autres fois la Physique, d'autre fois la Politique ou les Arts faisoient le sujet de nos entretiens; car il n'est pas d'objets qui aient échappé à M. Jefferson, & il semble que dès sa jeunesse il ait placé son esprit, comme sa maison, sur un lieu élevé, d'où il pût contempler tout l'univers.

ATCHESON L. HENCH.

University of Virginia.

NOTE ON LYLY'S *EUPHUES*

Near the close of *Euphues and his England* Lyly mentions "the severity of Cato who removed Manilius from the Senate, for that he was seen to kiss his wife in the presence of his daughter." This may have been derived from Plutarch, *Marcus Cato*, xvii, where Manilius is mentioned by name. Mr. M. W. Croll's edition cites the same incident from Plutarch's *Conjugal Precepts*, xiii, but there the name of the offender is omitted.

W. P. MUSTARD.

¹ *Voyages de M. le Marquis de Chastellux dans l'Amérique Septentrionale*, second ed., Paris, chez Prault, 1788, vol. 2, 36-7.

REVIEWS

The Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle. Edited by EDITH J. MORLEY. Oxford University Press, 1927. 2 vols. 42 sh. (\$14.00).

Leopardi and Wordsworth. By GEOFFREY L. BICKERSTETH. Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy, 1927. Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York. \$.70.

The Mysticism of William Blake. By HELEN C. WHITE. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature. Madison, 1927. Pp. 275. \$2.50.

Chronologically Robinson belonged to the famous group, William and Dorothy Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, and Lamb, who were born between 1770 and 1775. Among his numerous merits, however, was his never pretending to be one of them in literary genius. He was quick to discover greatness, whole-hearted in his admiration of it, and desirous of serving it with all his abilities, which were many and precisely such as poets rarely possess. His knowledge of law, of business, of people in different spheres from theirs, of foreign countries, his practical judgment, his active energy, his cheerfulness, his appreciation of their efforts, and his faith in their future fame were freely devoted to his great friends. He looked for no reward save the enjoyment of their society and the hope that some day his diaries and letters might be useful to biographers. The collection, which is preserved in Dr. Williams's Library, Gorden Square, London, comprises about 5,000 letters and a great pile of note-books and diaries. Dr. Sadler, in 1869, two years after the kind old lawyer's death, published about one third of what is really important and about one twentieth of what exists in the entire mass. Professor Knight, for his *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, 1907, picked out material here and there, copying it carelessly however. During the war these precious memorials of great English and German writers (for Robinson was also a friend of Goethe, Wieland, and other German celebrities) were kept in a coal cellar for fear of bombing raids, and black dust crept between the pages. The Royal Society of Literature has therefore done well to grant a subsidy for transcribing and editing the most valuable of the letters; the Oxford University Press has done well to undertake the printing of these large volumes; and Miss Morley deserves credit for performing her task with extreme care. Indeed, it seems to have been done with unnecessary and pedantic excess of care, obvious errors of penmanship being preserved and noted.

It is annoying to have one's attention directed to harmless repetitions and omissions and to careless spelling and punctuation by the warning *sic*. And at least half of the matter in these volumes is so trivial that it should have been left in oblivion.

There is something far more regrettable, though the fault is not Miss Morley's. The central figure is of course Wordsworth; and since Robinson did not meet him till 1808, we see in these pages the second and inferior poet of that name, for Robinson was a true prophet and a candid friend when he wrote to Dorothy Wordsworth in 1826: "I assure you it gives me real pain when I think that some future commentator may possibly hereafter write 'This great poet survived to the fifth decennary of the nineteenth century, but he appears to have died in the year 1814, as far as life consisted in an active sympathy with the temporary welfare of his fellow creatures.'" Whatever the date of his "death," the original, unique Wordsworth, the bold innovator, the hopeful believer in human equality as a desirable end of struggle and sacrifice, the man who found divine intimations not in human ordinances or tradition but in nature, does not appear in these letters. When Dorothy's robust health gives way, in 1829, we lose the last of the old happy voices.

It would be better for Wordsworth's fame if this book had not been published, for it puts us back into the period when people were still blind to the fact that the great Wordsworth died young. There are readers, no doubt, who prefer the later poems and would have admired the cautious old man who deliberately refused to countenance the causes of justice and liberty, but it is incomprehensible that they should understand and understanding enjoy the early works, which revolutionized poetry and poetized the revolution. Crabb Robinson himself, though he loved the man and appreciated the many fine qualities that exist even in the poems written after 1814, could not help regretting the change. So did many others who were independent enough to admire without worshipping, such as Charles Lamb, Mrs. Clarkson, and Harriet Martineau. But they were Radicals, Unitarians, and Quakers, forsooth, and tolerated by the inner circle chiefly for old sake's sake. Coleridge scarcely appears in the picture, nor dear kind Tom Poole, nor generous Cottle.

Miss Morley in her Introduction has adopted that tone of official apology and veneration for the second Wordsworth which one finds in his nephew's "Memoirs." This is perhaps better than if she had taken a superior or over-critical attitude, but still it must be admitted that the "Wordsworth circle" of 1815-1850 was narrower than it needed to be and contrasts unpleasantly with the group that had a triple centre, "three persons and one soul," during the twelve years that ended in 1808. Those who can perceive the decline and yet preserve their admiration of Wordsworth's

best poetry, whether early or late, will find much to enjoy as well as much to lament in these volumes. Every line of Dorothy is fresh and sweet, breathing good sense and good feeling. Mrs. Wordsworth, though theoretically illiberal, was an admirable woman. Mrs. Clarkson's outbursts concerning Coleridge are of thrilling and puzzling interest. Harriet Martineau's letters are pungent enough, and though Robinson's are tepid they tell us what we want to know. The figure of Wordsworth himself is at times visible through the smoke of incense, an honest, lovable, old Tory with a heart full of mysterious pains and exaltation from his days of danger and glory.

One would like to suppress the sentimental portraits of the poet, his wife, and his daughter Dora, made by Miss Gillies in 1841; yet it is these that Miss Morley has, perhaps not inappropriately, chosen as illustrations for her book. They represent only too well the sensitive, self-conscious, devitalized "circle" to whom Crabb Robinson brought now and then a breath of frank criticism and the wholesome shock of news from the outside world.

Goethe complained in 1827 that the poets of that age wrote "as if they were ill and the whole world a hospital." Matthew Arnold, about fifty years later, protested that Wordsworth should be exempted from this charge and contrasted him with Leopardi, whom he took as a typical example of the sick, melancholy, discouraged, and discouraging poets. Mr. Bickersteth first of all distinguishes between the philosophic and the poetic criticism of life. Then turning to the latter kind, he lays before us, with a masterly sweep of comprehensive analysis, the three grand and simple divisions of Wordsworth's poetic endeavor and of Leopardi's, which we see at once to correspond exactly. These great contemporaries perceived and rejoiced, at the beginning, in "the mysterious magic with which all humble natural objects and naturally simple persons are invested." At a somewhat later stage, the growth of their intellects "dissipated the happiness of childhood" and they became "pessimists and the victims of profound melancholia." Then years brought to each "the philosophic mind," which enabled them, through "emotion recollected in tranquillity," to recover and more than recover what they had lost. The discovery of this close spiritual relationship between these two great men, living unknown to each other, is extremely interesting. It could have been made only by a scholar with broad understanding and sympathy who has perceived meanings which most readers miss. If for nothing else, the lecture would be valuable because it calls attention to the healthy love of happiness and the zeal for human welfare which animated the Italian poet, who is too often thought of as one who merely gave exquisite expression to denial and despair. That Wordsworth was almost constantly inspired by joy is fairly well known; but that Leopardi too can strengthen the heart by

visions of happiness, even though it fleets ever away, was not obvious, though Mr. Bickersteth shows that it is true. The more Leopardi is known, the more it will be perceived that he and Wordsworth and Goethe were the supreme triumvirate in poetry since Milton, and especially in that order of poetry which by its philosophic reality and significance gradually transforms the world.

Miss White's substantial book contains a summary of critical opinion concerning Blake, an exposition of the meaning of the term "mysticism," a survey of the characters and doctrines of many mystics, great and small, a study of Blake's personal experience and culture, a statement of his message in the Prophetic Books, and an estimate of the value of his mystical teaching. The field is vast and thorny. A deep and complex background, picturing many kinds and examples of religious genius had to be painted before the central figure could be drawn. The vague word "mysticism" had to be historically illustrated rather than defined, for it has meant many different things. The nineteen pages of bibliography appended to the text, including some of the most difficult works ever written, might raise a fear lest the author had been superficial in her treatment or fallen into the other extreme and drowned herself in the depths of her reading. But this apprehension vanishes as one proceeds, for, after a few pages which smack of pedantry and are badly written, Miss White strides clear of encumbrances and writes with ever increasing originality, simplicity, and power. She evidently perceives the impropriety of treating such a subject in a scientific rather than a speculative and freely imaginative way, for she emphasizes values rather than quantities, her own intuitions rather than the testimony of professed psychologists. To have indulged in dogmatism or much analysis would have been to ruin her undertaking. She has written with a touch sufficiently delicate, using suggestion where blunt assertion would have blown away the very objects of her contemplation. She seems to say: "Let those who think they understand Blake unfold their ideas as they please; let those who enjoy him express their enthusiasm; let those to whom his mystical writings appear unsound and unedifying tell us why they turn away from him; but let us not labor to reduce vision, symbol, and poetry to a system, and least of all attempt to demonstrate the inconsistencies of other interpreters." In such liberal and good-natured mood, and with no ostentation of learning, she has written a book of really enormous erudition, which rises, in the last two chapters, to noble heights of moral wisdom. The passage on the gospel of love, which begins on page 237, is one of these. In another notable passage she shows that Blake in his Prophetic Books exercised fancy rather than imagination, and therefore achieved "not so much the large centralizing of the world of human experience as the supple-

mentary creation of a world like yet alien." Her final, and commendably sober, judgment is that though Blake the prophet is interesting and suggestive, we still must "look for another." His system, in so far as is coherent, is inapplicable to human nature in the mass, though some of his ideas, amazing as they are, contain rich possibilities, both poetical and practical. It was well worth while to show that he was a genuine mystic, gifted with non-rational power to discern truth. Miss White has accomplished her purpose admirably, and by her long, patient toil has produced a work of great value in the united fields of philosophy and literature.

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER.

Princeton University.

An Introduction to Old Norse. By E. W. GORDON. Pp. lxxxiv + 1 + 383. Oxford University Press, New York, 1927 (with three maps and some illustrations). \$3.50.

This is a book splendidly printed on fine paper. Its aims are stated thus in the author's preface: "This book is an introduction to Old Norse studies for beginners, but it is intended to be comprehensive and self-contained as well as elementary. It aims at giving enough information to enable the beginner to acquire, without having to refer to any other book, a working knowledge of the Old Norse language and an acquaintance with the more important aspects of the literature."

Not only Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian (West Norse), but also some specimens of Old Swedish and Old Danish (East Norse) texts have been included, together with some representative Runic inscriptions. As the author remarks, it is important that the English student should have some knowledge of East Norse and Old Norwegian as it is chiefly from these sources that the Scandinavian element in English is derived.

As for the texts, they are "chosen primarily for their literary merit, but also to gain variety of illustration." Here I shall only point out that the author has included the texts dealing with the discovery of America by Icelanders more than 900 years ago. These texts ought to be of interest to American students.

But how is this work done? As I have no space for a detailed criticism of the whole work, I shall confine myself to some remarks on the Introduction and the Texts.

The Introduction is well written and will be helpful to the student, and there are comparatively few misstatements.

P. xxv: We are told that *Eiríkr rauði* "gave an attractive account of the new land (Greenland), and it is likely that he did find it attractive, in spite of the ironic name he gave it." In

Ari's *Íslendingabók* (selection 4/42, p. 35) we read: *Hann gaf nafn landinu ok kallaði Grænland, ok kvað menn þat myndu fýsa þangat farar, at landit ætti nafn gott.* That is to say, what *Þiríkr* had in mind was not so much irony as propaganda for the new land.

P. xxvii: *Svalbarðr*. Where does the author get this form? The *Landnáma*, from which the author's statement (p. xxxviii) is taken, has *tl Svalbarða* (probably gen. sg. of *Svalbarði* m.) and in later Icelandic sources we meet with the neuter form *Svalbarð*. Cp. Finnur Jónsson: *Svalbarde* (*Geografisk Tidskrift*, 1926, p. 80).

P. xlxvii: It is stated that "a man who knew many sagas was named with respect as *inn Fróði* or *inn Spaki*." These epithets, however, do not seem to have had the same meaning. The former was an attribute especially assigned to those who had a wide knowledge of genealogies and history (like *Ari inn fróði*), while *spakr* was primarily said of men of great (practical) wisdom and knowledge of the laws.

P. lxvi: "During the fifteenth century interest in the old literature waned, and in the sixteenth century disappeared almost entirely." This is a serious overstatement. As a matter of fact, interest in the old literature never has disappeared in Iceland, although it has had its ups and downs. According to *Páll E. Ólason*, *Menn og menntir* iv, p. 2, there are from this time not only numerous manuscripts containing poems, old and contemporary, many of which are not to be found elsewhere, but there are also many copies of sagas and lawbooks, which show the vivid interest in the old literature in those alleged dark and unlettered centuries.

The revival of interest marked by the works of *Arngrímur Jónsson* was not such a great event in Iceland as it was in the learned world outside Iceland. His writings were in fact inspired by derogatory things, which foreigners had written about Iceland. In disproving their ridiculous and malicious tales, he naturally could not help citing and describing much of the national literature, and this information falling into the hands of foreign—especially Scandinavian (Danish and Swedish)—scholars, may be regarded as like seed from which Old Norse philology and antiquarian studies have developed.

In reading over the texts, I have noted about 50 errors, some of which I will give here, as they may not all be mere misprints. P. 3 in the prefatory note: *Sturla Þórðsson*, read: *Þórðarson*; p. 22, 31: *fylgði erminum*, read: *ermunum*; p. 23, 47: *ofungr*, read: *of ungr*; p. 25, 125: *ofsein*, read: *of sein*; p. 36, 58: *Mossfelli*, read: *Mosfelli*; p. 49, 269: *litask*, read: *litask*; p. 63, 114: *í Íslandi*, read: *á Íslandi*; p. 66, 224: *hlýpi*, read: *hlypi*; p. 83, 3: *ef bóndi líkaði*, read: *ef bónda*; p. 83, 6: *hlýtir*, read: *hlytír*; p. 90, 8: *inn*, read: *inní*, p. 101, 25: *Sigvaldi barðisk*, read: *berðisk*; p. 103, 122:

at skip Vagns, read: *skipi*; p. 136, 112: *ok eigut þær varðir vesa*, read: *vera*. In this case the author evidently has taken the acc. pl. of *verr* to be the inf. of the verb *vera*, which he normalizes *vesa*. P. 138, 168. *þeir fóru allar til Jórðánár*, read: *allir . . . Jórðánar*. As shown by the form *Jórðáná* given in the Index of names, the author seems unaware that the nom. is *Jórðán*, in spite of the fact that in line 175 on the same page we read the acc. *Jórðán*. P. 163: In the Old Icelandic translation of No. 2: *ok né saxi skorinn*, read: *ok né saxi steinn skorinn*. The word *návím* at least ought to be marked with an asterisk.

In enumerating the best editions of the Elder Edda (p. 118), the author fails to mention the classical edition, that of S. Bugge, *Norræn Fornkvæði. Sæmundar Edda hins fróða*. Christiania 1867, a photomechanical reprint of which appeared in 1926. In addition to this I will mention the new commentary by Gering: *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda* von Hugo Gering. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgg. von B. Sijmons. Erste Hälfte: Götterlieder. Halle (Saale) 1927.

The heading *Smá stykki*, p. 132, is not an idiomatic expression of Icelandic, Old or Modern, but common enough in the other modern Scandinavian languages, as, e. g., Danish: *Smaa Stykker*. In Icelandic the heading could have been: *Smálki* with the same meaning.

As the original editions of the East Norse texts have not been accessible to me, I have not been able to check them, except selection xix—to a certain degree—by comparison with B. Sjöros: *Aldre Vestgötalagen*, Helsingfors, 1919. The text given by Professor Gordon differs in numerous instances of detail both from that of the MS., as read by Sjöros, and from his normalized text—naturally enough. But since Sjöros himself states that his reading in some instances differs from that of Schlyter (from which our author's text), I make no alterations, except in one case: p. 150, 8, *aldrægøtø* which certainly ought to be *aldrægøtæ*, gen. pl. So the Ms., according to Sjöros.

In the texts the editor adopts certain rules, which are not to be found in other normalized Icelandic texts, and as these peculiarities seem to be derived from Mod. Engl. usage only, there is nothing to be said in their favour:

(1) The editor uses capitals in numerous instances, where they are not used in ordinary normalized Icelandic, so e. g., in nicknames: *Ari inn Fróði*, *Haraldr Harðráði* ordinarily *Ari inn fróði* *Haraldr harðráði*, words pertaining to the Christian faith such as *Kristinn* adj. *Kristni* f., neither of which is entitled to a capital, words denoting languages as *Norræna* f. *pýska* f. and adjectives denoting nationality, as *Ænskir menn* 17/96.

(2) The rules of syllable-division adopted by the editor (cp. grammar §§ 27, 28) are not in accord with those used in normalized

Icelandic texts. But the editor does not even follow his own rules in some instances, where the printer seems to have decided the matter *ad libitum*.

(3) The editor seems to be very parsimonious in his use of commas, and this is to be regretted, as punctuation does much to help a beginner to a right understanding and prevent him from running together words which have nothing to do with each other. From the Glossary it appears indeed that the editor is not free from committing such elementary blunders himself.

As an example: clauses beginning with the conjunction *at* always are preceded by a comma in ordinary Icelandic texts. Our editor in many instances has no comma, apparently following the English usage in *that*-clauses. For instance, p. 97, 228, *þinum at síðan*, read: *þinum, at síðan*; or some clauses from the beginning of the Grettis-saga-extract: 8. 5-8, *Muntu hafa heyrt getit (,) um hvat hér er at væla. En ek vilda gjarna (,) at þú hlýtir (! for hlýtir) engi vandræði af mér. En þó at þú komisk heill á brott, þá veit ek fyrir vist (,) at þú missir hests þíns. . .* Such examples may be multiplied, I am sorry to say. The glossary shows that the editor has not understood the verb *væla* and of course, then, not the construction either. Similar carelessness is often shown in the Notes, Grammar and Glossary, which I hope to be able to comment on elsewhere.

Otherwise the Notes are copious and often very good, especially in explaining *realia*. Likewise, the grammar seems to be a fairly good elementary grammar well answering its purpose.

It is a pity that so well planned and good a book should be so marred by carelessness in the details of editing. But in spite of its shortcomings, which certainly are not too great to be easily removed in the next edition, the book may be recommended to students wishing to have a look at the Old Norse—and especially the Old Icelandic world.

STEFÁN EINARSSON.

The Johns Hopkins University.

English Preachers and Preaching, 1640-70. By CAROLINE F. RICHARDSON. New York: Macmillan, 1928. Pp. xii + 359. \$2.50.

The sermon as a literary form and as a part of English literature has had altogether too little attention paid it. It deserves monographs, and it is allotted chapters in general histories. Nor are the masterpieces of English pulpit eloquence reprinted and edited as are the works of Bossuet and his compatriot preachers. Mr. Pearsall Smith's selections from Donne's sermons might, to the

delectation and profit of the world, be paralleled with selections from the sermons of Lancelot Andrewes and some of the other great Jacobean and Carolinian divines. We very much need a history of the sermon as a prose form and analyses of the style of particular preachers: what we ordinarily get is biography and impressionism.

Miss Richardson does not, any more than Dr. Owst, in his recent and admirable *Preaching in Mediaeval England*, give us a thorough-going analysis of homiletic construction and style, though like him she devotes a not very extensive section to the 'Formal construction of the sermon'; what she says upon 'Euphuistic phrasing' is excellent and to the point. Both writers are, rather, interested in the general background of the sermon: occasions of preaching; popularity of sermons—and sermonists; the character of the preachers and their manners. Miss Richardson emphasises her desire to give us 'the human, everyday side' of the clergy; her book is to be 'a sort of *Defensio pro Clerico Anglicano*, an effort to give the human side of a group that is neither so dull nor so doctrinal as tradition stamps it.' In this effort she succeeds admirably, surely in part because of her copious and apt use of Pepys and the other diarists, who, whatever their defects as sermon-tasters, had an eye for the 'human side' of the preachers under whom they sat.

All the six chapters, largely intelligent compilation from the seventeenth century itself, abound in interesting material, but that on *The Secular Interests of the Clergy* is at once the longest and the most authoritative. From the biographies and memorial sermons of the period Miss Richardson collects testimony to the avocations of her preachers,—their research not merely in the sacred languages and the classics but in heraldry, numismatics, medicine, Anglo-Saxon, Irish; their taste in painting and music; their 'travel diaries.' All this is invaluable to the student of priest-poets like Crashaw and Herbert and of great value to all students of the period.

The time limits of the book are difficult to understand. Why 1640-1670? Its author attempts no *rationale*. But, on the other hand, she does not limit herself precisely to her thirty years, as a recourse to the excellent index will attest. Donne and Andrewes, both pre-Commonwealth, come in for consideration, as do Crashaw and Herbert and Herrick.

The whole study is carefully documented, and there is a bibliography.

AUSTIN WARREN.

Boston University.

L'Influence du Naturalisme Français sur les Romanciers Anglais, de 1885 à 1900. By WILLIAM C. FRIERSON. Paris: Marcel Giard, 1925. Pp. 293.

An important part of Mr. Frierson's book has already been summarized by the author himself in *PMLA.* for June, 1928 ("The English controversy over Realism in Fiction")—and utilized by others. His title "Influence of French Naturalism on English Novelists," is, I am glad to say, a little misleading. What is an "influence"? How can it be detected and proved? Mr. Frierson hints more than once (cf. p. 53) at the vanity of trying to delimitate spheres of influence in the realm of literature and, as a wise man, he devotes more space and attention to individual novelists than to "currents" and "tendencies." In fact, the bulk of his volume is made of short monographies on more or less realistic English novelists. He calls Moore and Crackanthorpe English naturalists, though neither is undiluted English or naturalist. The first acted as a reflector, the second as a condenser of the various tendencies represented by French realism. Mr. Frierson dubs Lowry, George Egerton, Harland, and some others "Maupassant's disciples" though Maupassant would surely have disclaimed the spiritual paternity of that much mixed following. He enrolls Henry James, Gissing and Bennett (why these and not others?) under the same banner as "Realists under French influence." But Mr. Frierson does not attach an undue importance to labelling; he is concerned with men rather than mentalities. Let him be praised for it. Perhaps he might have abstained more carefully from intrusions like: "I have already said" "You will find later on" "I say this here, nor elsewhere, because." But, as Pierre Janet has often pointed out, the greater part of modern learning is not only teaching, but teaching how to teach. Let us not quarrel with a slight overdose of didacticism. The important thing is that Mr. Frierson does not exaggerate the scope and significance of his categories and does not puff the frame at the expense of the portrait. Some merit, that, in a University thesis. . . .

I do not know whether he realizes to what extent literary manifestoes, mottoes, cenacles and war-cries are, at least in France, *moyens de parvenir* and instruments of publicity. But he was shrewd enough to unearth and quote Zola's admission to the Goncourts: "Je me moque comme vous du mot naturalisme. Mais il faut un baptême aux choses pour que le public les croie neuves." And he restores to the Scandinavians their rightful part of what is attributed to French influence in the English literature of the nineties, concerning *sex-conflict*.

Realism and surrealism, naturalism and idealism, romanticism and classicism are useful words, good implements for analysis:

what can a professor do without his set of strong and flexible "isms"? But let them remain what they are, i. e. means to an end, not an end in themselves.

History and literature bury their dead in sand, but so deep and so promptly that, of all generations, we are especially ignorant of the one that just preceded us. Hence the apparent paradox of false perspective in recent history. Even resurrection demands more than a day. Both English and French naturalists were still lying higgledy-piggledy in the twilight of Easter Eve when Mr. Frierson took them by the hand and said: "Awake." His attempt to place them in their true relation is not only welcome, but on the whole successful. I am not sure, however, that he does not, like many others, over-dramatize and over-synchronize his literary "movements." The leaders of naturalism were not quite so triumphant in France and oppressed in England as he makes them. I speak from experience, not from books and hearsay. As a young man, I lived that period at headquarters in both countries. French naturalism was, in the fateful year 1890, still a bugbear to the Academy and a thing of the past, almost negligible, to my young contemporaries. . . . We cultivated symbolism and fantasy, Mallarmé, Barrès, Verlaine, and divided our attentions between *La Plume* and *Le Chat Noir*.

Naturalism and Realism were at the same time a vanguard in England and a rearguard in France. The battle in England for an unlimited freedom and fidelity of expression, chiefly in sexual matters, was longer and harder because English art is above all social and moral. Perhaps that battle will never be won—except by self-exiled Americans—or by English women novelists, who will manage to extract a fresh and frisk morality out of a-moralism, transform restraint into disease and create a new Gospel of Nature. Thus re-baptized and sanctified, the Naturalism of 1890 will be hailed as the true religion, Mr. Frierson's heroes will be venerated as prophets, and Mr. Frierson himself as their truthful re-discoverer and interpreter.

ABEL CHEVALLEY.

Paris.

The Social Philosophy of William Morris. ANNA VON HELMHOLTZ-PHELAN. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1927. Pp. ii + 197.

Dr. von Helmholtz-Phelan has written a readable account of William Morris' social philosophy. The first part of her book is an excellent summary of the facts of Morris' career as gathered by Mackail and Vallance. But when she comes to her topic in the latter sections of the book, her facts do not seem to fit her thesis. One does not question that she has read Morris thoroly. But she

has read him with the aid of her own enthusiastic Socialism, which has led her to delve too much into Karl Marx and to neglect almost entirely the real sources of his thought which were native. The key to her treatment is to be found in the following quotation from her rather fulsome preface:

It is a fair question as to whether Morris would still see hope for a happy life for a man through a return to simplified production and through the establishment of a democratic regime in industry. He *must have come to see* [my italics] that modern production cannot go back to an earlier form, and that not even democracy carried to the nth degree could accomplish such a miracle.

A less prejudiced reading of Morris should disclose the static and unoriginal character of his thinking. His ideas derive almost entirely from English sources, especially from Ruskin. He was born to become the master craftsman of the century to illustrate Ruskin's theories of art in industry. The very style of his critical writings, particularly those addressed to workingmen like *Hopes and Fears for Art*, is that of Ruskin's prose. The resemblances to Marx are for the most part coincidence. When Morris read him late in life, he confessed he couldn't understand him. And the new socialist movement in England was split in two because Mr. Hyndman favored State Socialism and Morris did not. Later, indeed, Morris did admit that a compromise with State Socialism was inevitable. In *Signs of Change* and in his utopian romance, *News from Nowhere*, he looked forward to a period of State Socialism. But he believed it would be only transitional. In due time, man, relieved from the tyranny imposed by commercial competition, would lose his artificial appetite for goods. Being content with what he needed, he would prefer quality to mere abundance of goods. And quality, Morris stated, could be secured only by discarding most of our complicated modern machinery and returning to such handicraft as he himself was engaged in. Morris had almost as temperamental a dislike for machinery and the factory system as Ruskin.

Tho I have found no evidence that Morris had read Godwin, he was even more than his master Ruskin a Godwinian in his disapproval of modern industrial life. He looked forward eventually to that simple decentralized life in villages, indifferent to world or even to national affairs, which is expounded theoretically in *Political Justice* and imaginatively in *News from Nowhere*, and which Morris in *A Dream of John Ball* and 'Feudal England' from *Signs of Change* believed almost came into existence towards the end of the XIV century. This attitude is not 'progressive' but obscurantist, and Morris in thought and emotion never wavered from it. Only in purely social theory, in ideas about marriage and the treatment of criminals, was Morris progressive rather than medieval. But his ideal of woman, despite his Godwinian objection to

the marriage tie, was, like the Victorian, romantically medieval. Woman's place was not in business. Dr. von Helmholtz-Phelan dismisses Morris' ideas about women as 'entirely uncritical,' one suspects, because they were not thoroly feminist. And a predilection for State Socialism similarly prejudices her reading of the text when the subject is economic theory.

Washington Square College,
New York University.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM.

One Word More on Browning. By FRANCES THERESA RUSSELL.
Stanford University Press, 1927. Pp. xi + 157.

"No poet has met more vicissitudes of reputation or experienced greater extremes of critical temperature" than has Robert Browning. "If for twenty years he was nearly suffocated by fulsome eulogy, it no more than made amends for almost forty years of frosty indifference tempered by little showers of ridicule." Yet he has suffered "even more from the worship of admirers than from the carping of detractors" (128-131).

Studies that for the greater part have appeared in various journals, with some revision now make up a volume that merits careful reading by serious students of Browning's life and work. An example of clear-sighted criticism may be found in the comments on the successes and the failures in *Saul*, "the most perfect epitome of the poet," "the distilled essence of Browning," the poem that "both reveals and betrays him to the fullest extent," that "tells more about the poet than does any other one." I cite other comments that show critical insight: "He . . . evidently said everything he ever thought of, with fewer consignments to the waste-basket than would have been advisable" (2); "Too verbose and moralistic to be the perfect artist" (13), he practiced "an art that was in spite of his own devotion to Hellenic culture more Gothic than Grecian" (74); his "incurable habit of being jocular out of season" (65); in actual amount his optimism "is far outweighed by his pessimistic pronouncements" (48); "his lack of a definite conception of the meaning of tragedy" (56). Though he called himself "Robert Browning, writer of plays," he was a failure in play-writing"; "he is at his best when he is frankly presenting Robert Browning ventriloquizing through bishops, politicians, musicians, and murderers" (92-5).

Professor Russell dwells upon Browning's cavalier treatment of history,—his "unfortunate predilection for a basic stuff of actuality, which he was totally incapable of presenting in its actual condition, for he could not be trusted around the corner as guardian of a fact" (67). "The most flagrant case of Browning's freedom

with facts recorded and verifiable is *The Ring and the Book*, in which he is also the most voluble about the his fidelity" (69). "For his version of the Franceschini prosecution and defense there is no real warrant in the source document, *The Old Yellow Book*" (45). Although "he was unquestionably self-hypnotized and sincere" (113), believing himself "true to the Book in all its details," he was guilty of suppression, alteration, addition, of characters, situations, incidents. These are the result of "a prejudiced interpretation," of "ingenious manipulation to line up such facts as are used in support of a preconceived theory" (114). Browning's handling of his material Mrs. Russell very properly terms "his manhandling of the law" (45). Such transformations are the admitted prerogatives of an imaginative artist such as Browning unquestionably was, if only he does not repeatedly insist that his record contains "pure crude fact," "live truth," "mere truth, nothing else."

The longest essay in the volume, "Gold and Alloy," was prompted by the publication in 1925 of a new translation of *The Old Yellow Book*, with notes and critical chapters by Judge Gest, of Philadelphia. He shows that "Browning had no acquaintance whatever with the law of the Old Yellow Book, and apparently had no desire to acquire it. . . . His ignorance of the subject was profound." Yet "he devoted two entire books to the arguments of counsels. . . . The consequence was that these books are not only false but silly, and many of even his most ardent admirers consider them to be serious blemishes" (Gest, p. 625). "So far as the facts of the Old Yellow Book are concerned, we see that Browning produced . . . not the pure gold of truth, but the gilded ring of his imagination. So far as concerns the personages of the story, we . . . find that Browning has failed also to reproduce their characters as they really were" (623). Caponsacchi "was not a priest, did not claim to be a priest, and is never called a priest in the Old Yellow Book. . . . Yet Browning, who must have known the fact, makes Caponsacchi claim to be a priest, and constantly refers to him as such. . . . Poor little Pompilia [was] not an angel of light, but a frail and faulty girl, whose pathetic fate cannot but excite our compassion" (629).

The essay entitled "Gold and Alloy" is an important one for readers who lack time or opportunity for the perusal of Judge Gest's 669 pages. The thirteen essays and the brief bibliographies in Professor Russell's book are not for beginners in Browning, or yet for casual readers of his poetry. They are of value to students, most helpful, perhaps, to the many who have been misled, or hypnotized, by the emphatic assertions of the poet.

London.

H. E. GREENE.

Browning's Parleyings, the Autobiography of a Mind. By WILLIAM CLYDE DEVANE, JR. Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. x + 306.

To take as a subject for investigation and presentation the poorest output of a garrulous poet who perpetrated an unconscionable amount of poor stuff is in itself to take a dare. To transmute this unpromising theme into a volume that can be read with both profit and pleasure is to win against odds. To present a fresh point of view, verified and substantiated by hitherto neglected documentary matter, concerning a writer already smothered under exegesis and commentary, is a notable feat. To be judicious in appraisal of complex and often contradictory data is a genuine accomplishment. All these difficult things have been achieved by Professor DeVane in this the latest book about Robert Browning.

The critic's interpretation of the poet's *Parleyings* as a veiled intellectual autobiography is the result of patient and accurate exploration of primary sources, capably marshalled as evidence in support of a new but indisputable thesis. To the remark of a previous biographer that although these people may have been "of importance in their day," they are of none in ours, Dr. DeVane adds by implication the idea that although the people themselves never achieved importance, they had importance thrust upon them by serving as exponents of the many-faceted Browning doctrine.

Being a product of his old age, this group of poems is supposed to furnish a synthesis of the author's digested philosophy, and reveal his personality through his attitudes to sundry salient aspects of life. And so it does, but less reliably and conclusively than is assumed by Professor DeVane. In the first place, the "most cherished opinions" thus dramatized are of a more negative nature than positive. In so far as Browning is satirizing the demagoguery of Disraeli and the gloom of Carlyle over the heads of Dodington and Mandeville, inasmuch as the rhapsodic Christopher Smart and the pseudo-classical Laresse are instruments of rebuke to Pre-Raphaelites and Hellenists nearer home, if the objectors to the artistry of Mr. Barrett Browning are anathematized through Baldinucci's attack on Furini, we are indeed thereby informed as to the poet's disapprovals and antipathies, but can only "conversely" infer his beliefs and enthusiasms. In the second place, these imaginary interviews are far from being our only source of knowledge as to Browning's views on art, politics, and metaphysics. Practically all of them have been hinted, developed, ramified, elsewhere in his poems, most of them many times. And in the third place, some of his pet theories and reiterated convictions do not happen to be mentioned here at all. Not all of Browning's interests are registered in these seven samples chosen as types,

although they do as a whole form his rainbow of hope and promise, appropriately stretched athwart a sky of damp and drab reality.

In being unable to see the sky for the rainbow, Dr. DeVane follows the stereotyped tradition of Browning the Optimist. While he knows better than to take the poet seriously as a thinker, he does accept his optimistic protestations at their face value, ignoring the subtle significance in the fact that the gentleman certainly doth protest too much. On this point the critic is sometimes as hard put to it as the poet to make out a plausible case: as, for instance, his diagnosis of the Fates telling the *truth* about life when under the influence of wine. Usually, and it would seem, logically, the inebriate view of life is accounted a blissful illusion and not the higher vision induced by imagination. This tale of Apollo's wily trick on the dread Sisters is described by Mr. Devane as weird and dark, prosaic and dull, but essentially a justification of human existence. Yet when read as candidly as written, with no piety or idealism read into it or between the lines, it sounds much more like a bright and gay story, surcharged with vividness and wit (it is the Prologue that redeems the Parleyings) but essentially a repudiation of mortal life, voiced by the mordant, sardonic mirth that laughs because it scorns to weep or to rail, to reform or to applaud our destiny, or any such futility.

This, however, is neither the complete key to Browning nor an impairing discount of this excellent treatment of the poet and his work. Together with the momentous discussion of *The Ring and the Book* by Judge Gest, Professor DeVane's analysis of the *Parleyings* constitutes just the kind of re-examination and re-evaluation most needed to re-introduce Robert Browning, man and artist, to a twentieth century audience.

FRANCES THERESA RUSSELL.

Stanford University.

La Muerte del Conde de Villamediana. Por ALONSO CORTÉS (Narciso). Valladolid, Imprenta del Colegio Santiago. 1928. 95 pp.

Don Juan de Tassis y Peralta, Conde de Villamediana, has long been regarded as one of the most intriguing personalities in Spanish letters. Favored by birth with wealth and high social position, he was a prominent figure at the Court of Philip III from early boyhood, and became the leader of the *jeunesse dorée* of his time. Constantly in difficulty because of his prodigalities and passion for gambling, a connoisseur and collector of paintings, precious stones and fine horses, he was also a poet of real distinction who alternately poured abuse upon his political and personal enemies and

addressed the ladies of his heart in the new-fangled *culto* verse that his friend Góngora had brought into fashion at Court.

Villamediana's sentimental education continued throughout his life, and scandal-mongers found in his conduct much food for gossip. When his allegorical play *La Gloria de Niquea* was presented in the gardens of Aranjuez on the evening of May 15, 1622, and a fire on the stage brought the performance to an abrupt ending, tongues began to wag furiously, and epigrams to circulate. It was rumored that Villamediana himself had set fire to the scenery in order to carry the Queen from danger in his own arms, or as some believed, Doña Francisca de Tavora, a Portuguese lady-in-waiting of the Queen, who played the part of *Abril* in that entertainment and with whom the King was said to be in love. Only a few months later, on the evening of August 21, the Count was struck down by an assassin as he was returning home from the Palace, and was buried with unwonted haste. Even at the time there was much mystery about the affair. The poets were nearly unanimous in ascribing his death to someone whom he had offended in his verses, but gossip was also current that Philip IV had taken this way to rid himself of a rival. There is little wonder that the Count has appeared as a romantic lover in many plays and novels.

Señor Alonso Cortés reviews briefly the life of Villamediana, correcting, at times, and making many additions to the biography of the Count written over forty years ago by the lamented Cotarelo y Mori. As a result of his skilful interpretation of the contemporaneous accounts in prose and verse, it now seems evident that the King and Villamediana were in fact rivals for the love of Doña Francisca de Tavora. Furthermore, the learned critic of Valladolid publishes certain documents to the effect that the Council of Castile had proof that the Count practised sodomy and that only his death had stayed proceedings against him. The greatest secrecy was observed because of the Count's exalted position at Court, which probably explains the paucity of documents, but it seems no mere coincidence that less than four months after the Count was killed, five youths were burned to death at Madrid "por el pecado nefando," of whom two were servants of Villamediana.

At the risk of appearing as *advocatus diaboli*, I am not sure that these documents establish the guilt of Villamediana. The most incriminating evidence consists of two reports signed by Fernando Ramírez Fariña in which he speaks, in dealing with another similar case, "de lo que está probado contra el Conde de Villamediana." We do not know whether this "proof" indicates a decision made by the entire Council of Castile after hearing evidence for and against the guilt of Villamediana, or whether it represents only the opinion of Ramírez Fariña who, as a member of the Council, was acquainted with the evidence. We could hardly ex-

pect Ramírez Fariña to be wholly impartial since we know from an exchange of verses that they were far from being on friendly terms. It is true that the King was acquainted with some details of the case and commanded the greatest secrecy after Villamediana's death, but the King and Count were in love with the same lady. Evidence is given that some persons were aware of the danger of the punishment that confronted him and that others knew of his alleged aberrations, but this may be due to hearsay or malice. So far as I can see, we have no proof in these documents that Villamediana was definitely tried on this charge, and we do know that he had a host of enemies who were only too ready to believe the worst about him.

The question asked by the poets of the time, namely: "¿Quién mató al Conde?" still stands. Perhaps the order to kill was given by the Duque del Infantado who, aware of the nature of the charges, wished to spare his long-suffering niece, Villamediana's wife, from further scandal. Perhaps the King himself, from somewhat similar motives, ordered his death, or the King's jealousy may have been the sole motive. There is also a chance that his death was entirely unrelated to the charge hanging over him and that it came as punishment for "tiernos yerros amorosos" as Céspedes y Meneses conjectured, or in retaliation for some verse that fell from the Count's blistering tongue, as his friends believed or pretended to believe.

Señor Alonso Cortés has brought together a large amount of new and interesting material, and has interpreted it with the excellent judgment that we always find in his work. I share his hope that someone will make a careful study of Villamediana's verse which will show the importance of his position in Spanish letters.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

Milton Papers. By DAVID H. STEVENS. "Modern Philology Monographs." The University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. x + 46. \$2.00.

Professor Stevens's little volume of Milton gleanings contributes materials of interest and value to the growing store of detail which will some day have to be incorporated either in a revised Masson or in a new biography of similar inclusiveness. The first paper deals with several documents recording the investment of over £1,000 in London property by the Milton family between 1621 and 1629. Professor Stevens surmises that the house in St. Martin's in the Fields, adjacent to Covent Garden, for which the poet and his father took a joint deed, May 27, 1627, may have served

as a town residence for the Miltons in the period 1627-1637. Of this there is not further proof than the fact that Milton dates an epistle of 1634 "e nostro suburbano", a phrase which would apply but loosely and apparently against contemporary usage to the Horton estate, sixteen miles away. Further documents, this time concerning the shabby affairs of the Powell family and the never-to-be-paid dowry of the luckless Mary, are brought to light in the second essay. Of more general interest are the papers which deal with Milton in his literary rather than his economic or domestic relationships. Professor Stevens has cast a scholar's eye on the Bridgewater MS. of *Comus* and discovered by comparison with the Trinity MS. and the various editions, some surprising things: first, that certain stage directions were apparently added by Lawes after the stage version had been copied fair by another hand; second, that these and other directions from the stage version were incorporated by Milton into his own Trinity MS. draft, where they stand as clear additions to the original. Lawes, therefore, becomes a contributor to the final text of *Comus* and Milton himself a partner in the publication of the 1637 edition, which purports to be the unsponsored enterprise of his musician friend.

The other *Comus* paper, a review of the eighteenth century stage versions, adds little to Thaler's more elaborate study of this subject (*Studies in Philology*, 1920). The brief note on Edward King, citing for the first time the provisions of his will (Aug. 1, 1637) gives a touch of reality to the dim figure of the elegies in the Cambridge memorial volume.

JAMES H. HANFORD.

Western Reserve University.

The American in England during the First Half Century of Independence. By. ROBERT E. SPILLER. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1926. 416 pp.

Professor Spiller's *The American in England* is a study of the attitude toward England and the English displayed by various American visitors in the British Isles from 1783 to 1835. Of their writings Professor Spiller says that very few "can be regarded as literature in the strict sense of the term," but he adds, rightly, that "it is equally unfair to consider them solely as source material for political and economic history," since "their greatest value lies in the understanding which they afford of the reciprocal attitudes of the two nations in each of the separate aspects of human contact." From a thorough and painstaking study of such material, printed and in manuscript, Professor Spiller has made a valuable and readable book. It will be more

illuminating, perhaps, to social than to literary historians, and more useful for students of English literature than of American, but no one who has any interest in the past can fail to be grateful for its many vivid pictures of a bygone England and of a bygone American point of view.

In general Professor Spiller has handled the vast amount of material bearing on his subject with accuracy and skill, and his interpretation of the evidence in order to present a clear statement of the standards of the American travellers, is uniformly excellent. In spite of an embarrassment of riches he has managed most adroitly to avoid overloading his pages with quotation and yet to include in transcript or paraphrase many passages which serve better than chapters of exposition in lighting up his subject. To take but three samples: Ticknor's record of how he was asked by Byron in 1815 whether Americans looked upon Joel Barlow as their Homer, sheds a vivid sidelight on the author of *The Vision of Columbus* and some of his countrymen, Henry B. McLellan's picture of Coleridge as he saw him richly deserved reprinting; and surely it is fascinating to discover Mary Lamb devouring "Cooper's novels with a ravenous appetite." Everyone interested in Cooper will welcome also the discussion of that novelist's comments on England. He has been too little studied as a social critic, and Professor Spiller's pages on him are a real contribution.

The volume includes a good bibliography of "Records of visits to England, 1783-1835, published as travel books" and a "selected list" of other similar records published wholly or in part in forms other than "travel books." Because Professor Spiller's text is so useful many readers will wish that instead of a "selected list" they might have a more nearly complete one, including manuscript material, and that the footnotes in this volume could have been more generous. What is said of the travellers and their writings stimulates a desire to read more of them; it is unfortunate that from this book it is not as easy as it might be to know where to find the complete texts from which Professor Spiller has drawn alluring extracts.

One or two queries may be raised, of course. When it is said that "for many years before the war [the Revolution], Americans had trained themselves in medicine, chemistry, theology, and law by study in British institutions," is not some qualification necessary, since relatively few Americans, and those usually from a few colonies, studied thus? Is it quite true that Unitarianism is one of the "formal religious expressions" of "that type of thought which in its philosophical aspects has been called transcendentalism?" It is puzzling to find the author explaining the fact that Oxford and Cambridge drew few students from America by saying that Cambridge was most famous for theoretical mathematics and Oxford for the classics, whereas "what young America went to England to acquire was knowledge and experience in the

professions, in the problems of the economic and industrial world, in religion, literature, and the fine arts." This may explain the neglect of Cambridge, but why did those whose attention was centered on "literature and the fine arts" or on religion, turn so seldom to Oxford? Did Americans a century ago consider the classics unrelated to literature and the fine arts, or was there some other reason which kept them from the oldest English university?

KENNETH B. MURDOCK.

Harvard University.

Math Vab Mathonwy. By W. J. GRUFFYDD. University of Wales Press Board, Cardiff, 1928.

Balor with the Evil Eye. By ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE. Institut des Études Françaises, Columbia University, 1927.

The first of these books is a work of fundamental importance in the interpretation of early Welsh literature, and secondarily of Arthurian romance. To his task Professor Gruffydd brings a rare combination of qualities: intimate knowledge of the whole range of Welsh literature and an only less intimate knowledge of Irish; a wide acquaintance with folklore and its processes; the instincts of a Celt, a scholar, and a poet.¹ The result is that he has not only illuminated the composition of this most perplexing piece of primitive literature, but is able to explain satisfactorily and in most instances conclusively every detail of that wild confusion. He shows that *Math* is like a composite of sections from different picture puzzles, fitted together into a new design. Most significant are two stories of Balor, preserved in modern Irish folktales. Thus the position of Nutt, Kittredge, and Miss Schoepperle² that modern Irish folklore often preserves source material for the study of medieval romance is amply vindicated. Other stories that have been worked in are those of Blathnat's betrayal of Cu Roi, the incestuous birth story, traditions of Blodeuwedd, the owl-woman, and of Gwydion, the enchanter. The author points out the importance of place-names and of the principle of making the punishment fit the crime as clues to the development of the *Mabinogion*.

The interest of this study for Arthurian scholars lies in the fact that here we have the first scientific exposition of that mixture of

¹ Mr. Gruffydd's earlier study of the *Mabinogion*, in the *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion Society*, 1912-13, is the best work on the subject.

² A. Nutt, *Studies on the Legend of the Holy Grail*, Publications of the Folklore Society xxiii (1888); G. L. Kittredge, *Arthur and Gorlagon*, Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, viii (1903); G. Schoepperle, *Tristan and Isolt*, Frankfurt and London, 1913.

Goidelic and Brythonic myth and folktale out of which we have reason to believe the Round Table cycle sprang. It proves that those Welsh traditions we possess are in a badly mangled state, and the lack of continuous correspondence between them and the romances does not argue for the lack of genuine Welsh tradition in the latter. There is nothing absurd in the belief that French romance often preserves a clearer, better motivated version than the mabinogi. Moreover, here are certain names which reappear in romance: Gilvaethwy son of Don = Giflet fis Do;³ Llew = Lion or Lionel;⁴ Pryderi = Peredur = Perceval;⁵ Blodeuwedd is related to Florie;⁶ and probably Arianrhod (Silver-Wheel) is represented by Lunete.⁷ One of Mr. Gruffydd's few mistakes is the identification of Arianrhod with Layamon's Argante, since the *Didot Perceval*, which at this point draws upon the same source as Layamon, ascribes to Arthur these words: "Je me ferai porter en Avalon por mes plaies mecier a Morghain me seror;"⁸ and since Bruce has shown how easily Morgan could become Argante.⁹ Mr. Gruffydd promises to give us studies of the other Branches and of their relation to the Arthurian legend. I know of no one more likely to furnish a definitive answer to the most perplexing questions of Arthurian origins than he, and it is to be hoped that his other multitudinous contributions to the modern culture of Wales will not too long delay his demonstration of what its ancient culture meant to Europe.

Professor Krappe brings his well-known exhaustive bibliographical knowledge of folklore and mythology to the discussion of a number of themes, most of which are concerned with the relations of Celtic and French literature. His first study of the Balor myth seems to me to combine much that is sound with much that is highly speculative. When Balor is presented at once as a Janus,

³ Gruffydd, p. 204 f.

⁴ Cf. the story of Llew, Gruffydd, 19-23, and the naming of Gawain's son Lions or Lioniaus. Cf. Potvin, *Perceval le Gallois*, iv, 16 f., and J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, London, 1906, i, 244 f. *Mort Artu*, ed. J. D. Bruce, Halle, 1910, 253 ff., gives the name Lyons to Bohors' son. Professor Nitze, in reviewing my *Celtic Myth*, wrongly attributed to me the notion that there was something astronomical about the manner of Llew's death, that the caldron stood for Aquarius and the buck for Capricornus. Cf. *MLN.*, XLII, 562. Gruffydd (p. 301-7) shows what is undoubtedly the true explanation of these circumstances.

⁵ R. S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, New York, 1927, 152-5, 201-4, 218-20.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 17 f., 22 f.

⁷ Gruffydd's derivation from *Argentoratum* (p. 189) seems improbable, and if there is any Welsh prototype for Lunete, it must be Arianrhod. Cf. Loomis, *op. cit.*, 287.

⁸ J. L. Weston, *op. cit.*, II, 111.

⁹ J. D. Bruce, *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, Baltimore, 1923, i, 33 n.; *MLN.*, XXVI, 65 f.

a Cyclops, and a possessor of the evil eye, it seems to me that all three traits cannot be taken as clues to his essential nature, and the theory that Ethnea was a cow because of a rather strained analogy with the Io story finds little confirmation. The parallel between the stories of Lug and Perseus, however, and the case for the Balor tale as the basis of *Yonac* are well founded. The next two papers urge forcefully the near-Eastern origin of a modern Breton folktale of the Circe type and of the Breton *Arthur and Gorlagon*.¹⁰ The text deals with the conception of souls in the form of birds among the Celts. Mr. Krappe disputes Miss Dunn's point that the bridge which rises underneath Perceval and which his horse clears by a happy leap is a development of Cuchulinn's very similar adventure, but none of his own analogues are as close. The adventure of Chaus in *Perlesvaus* is diagnosed as a combination of the Spectres' Mass and the Dream Visit to the Otherworld. The dream, however, is probably a late feature, introduced with eerie effect into a more standardized type of Otherworld adventure attributed to Kay.¹¹ Mr. Krappe demolishes completely Miss Weston's mystical interpretation of the fact that Perceval is a Widow's Son. In fact, it should be said that in spite of her wide range of interest and her intimate knowledge of Arthurian literature, there are few scholars less capable of critical judgment than Miss Weston. Finally, Mr. Krappe's amplification of the views of earlier scholars that Petieru's bell in *Tristan* and the hag who resurrects slain warriors in Gerbert's continuation of the *Conte del Graal* and in the Scandinavian legend of Hilde are due to Celtic influence, seems to me sound.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS.

Columbia University.

La Nouvelle Héloïse de J.-J. Rousseau. Etude et analyse. Par DANIEL MORNET, Professeur à la Sorbonne. Paris: Melloté, 1928. 340 pages.

L'étude débute par une lumineuse reconstruction de l'état d'âme de Jean-Jacques quand il écrit *la Nouvelle Héloïse* ou plutôt quand elle s'écrit en lui, rêve d'amour cristallisé autour de Madame d'Houdetot. C'est la passion de Jean-Jacques pour cette dernière qui transforma en "un débat pathétique sur la passion" ce qui n'avait été d'abord chez Rousseau que *day dream* et aspiration diffuse. Rousseau avait un passé sentimental assez trouble et riche d'expériences incomplètes. Vint la comtesse. On la voit très bien surgir des pages de M. Il a dû y avoir chez elle un mélange de

¹⁰ Gruffvld, p. 279. Cf. Professor Malone's excellent article, *PMLA*, XLII, 416-446.

¹¹ Cf. *MLN.*, XLIII, 218 f.

coquetterie et de douceur maternelle, une tendresse un peu amusée d'abord par ce grand fou plein de génie, à la fois puéril et intense. Puis elle a dû se prendre au jeu et finir par s'étonner encore plus d'elle-même que de lui. Sous la double pression des circonstances et des traditions livresques (le ton prédicant des romans anglais était alors à la mode) Rousseau fit de ce qui était d'abord le roman de la passion "celui de la fidélité conjugale et du bonheur. . . . Ses amants restent vertueux, tout en étant coupables." Ils seront vertueux à force de faire des discours sur la vertu. La vraie valeur de la *Nouvelle Héloïse* est dans le sentiment de la Nature et "la nouveauté du sentiment de la Nature, dans la Nouvelle-Héloïse, c'est qu'il est l'amour, la communion."

Quant à l'analyse qui est la seconde partie du livre de M. je ne connais guère de plus persuasive invitation à la lecture et à la réflexion.

Deux observations en passant: M. dit (page 30) qu'au temps de la *Nouvelle-Héloïse* le roman-confiance n'était pas encore inventé. Mais *Manon Lescaut* ne représente-t-elle pas quelque chose comme le roman-confiance?

On nous laisse l'impression (page 313) que le général baron Thiébault (l'auteur des *Mémoires*) est de ceux qui avaient écrit à Jean-Jacques au sujet de son roman. Or cela ne se peut: Thiébault n'avait que 6 ou 7 ans à la mort de Rousseau.

LOUIS CONS.

University of Illinois.

The "Merope" of George Jeffreys as a source of Voltaire's "Mérope." By T. E. OLIVER. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1927. 111 pp. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XII, No. 4.

Jeffreys' adaptation of Maffei's *Merope* was acted in 1731 and, thirteen years later, was referred to in contemptuous terms by Voltaire. When Jeffreys published a second edition of his play in 1754, he answered him by accusing him of having imitated his play in his own *Mérope* without acknowledging his indebtedness. There the matter rested until Professor Oliver undertook to examine the question in detail and to determine what Voltaire may have owed to Jeffreys. As the plays spring from a common source, the obvious method is to compare Voltaire's departures from Maffei's play with those made by Jeffreys. This O. has done with such care that no points of resemblance appear to have escaped his eye and, in order to help his reader follow his discussion, he has published a critical edition of Jeffrey's play. He lists some forty cases of what he takes to be borrowings and concludes that in accusing Voltaire of "petty larceny" Jeffreys was "far too gene-

rous." These results are forcefully presented and may, at first sight, be convincing. If, however, one investigates the subject from a broader point of view than that which O. has chosen, one may come to somewhat different conclusions.

The *Merope* theme was treated several times both in Italy and in France before Maffei and his imitators wrote. As Voltaire himself mentions plays on the subject by Gabriel Gilbert (*Téléphonte*, pub. 1642), de La Chapelle (*Téléphonte*, pub. 1683), and Lagrange Chancel (*Amasis*, pub. 1702), it is not improbable that he had read them. Moreover, Voltaire was quite capable of making, independently of his predecessors, certain departures from his source in the interest of the manners and technique of his day. We must, therefore, before accepting O.'s evidence, ask if the similarities he describes are found in these earlier dramatists or can be ascribed purely to Voltaire's ordinary dramatic methods. Now O. does admit (pp. 54, 67, 94, 105) that *Amasis* may have influenced Jeffreys and Voltaire, but he fails to mention the plays of Gilbert and de La Chapelle, although a study of the three dramas would have shown him that a number of the characteristics supposed to be peculiar to Jeffreys and Voltaire are found also in them.¹ Others, moreover, can readily be explained as due to Voltaire's desire to break up a tedious speech, to preserve the dignity of his characters, to emphasize political considerations, to heighten dramatic interest, etc.² Indeed the only characteristics mentioned by O. that seem to me to point to Jeffrey's having furnished suggestions to Voltaire are the references to Chresphonte's tomb and to Heaven's speaking at the end of the play, and these are such minor points that, if Voltaire had omitted them, they would scarcely have been missed.³

But, even though we do not accept O.'s theory except in regard to these two minor points, we should be grateful to him for bringing up the question and presenting all that can be said on Jeffreys' side of the argument. It is also useful to have a new and scholarly edition of this rare English play. The book is carefully printed and attractively presented. I have found almost no misprints.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

¹ Such are the proud and defiant spirit of the hero (La Chapelle), the use of cutting instruments (La Grange), the emphasis placed upon the activities of the queen's party (La Chapelle), the sympathy of the hero for *Merope* (La Grange), *Merope's* plans (Gilbert, La Chapelle) and thought of suicide (Gilbert), the striking of a religious note by the hero at the end of the play (Gilbert), etc.

² Such are various cases in which Voltaire and Jeffreys both develop ideas and incidents already found in Maffei, the fact that the hero struggles before he surrenders, the avoidance of too much violence in *Merope's* speeches, the political motivation of the tyrant's marriage, the hero's contempt for death.

³ Moreover, O. himself gives evidence that Voltaire had read Jeffreys inattentively (p. 69).

The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature. By HOWARD R. PATCH. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927, pp. xii + 215.

Professor Patch's admirable study is based on his dissertation presented for the doctorate at Harvard University in 1915. It does not aim at exhaustiveness, which would have involved encyclopaedic dimensions, but the large amount of material presented is sufficiently indicative of the richness of the literature of the subject, and amply illustrates the author's deductions.

The pre-Christian conception of Fortuna as a goddess of fate was later changed to signify one who brings about our destiny in a capricious way, as we find during the Roman Empire. During the Middle Ages, in spite of the anathemas of the Church, a general belief in the omnipotence of Fortuna prevailed, and she is sometimes to be found in company with the Christian God, as for example in *The Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, and in Dante's *Inferno*, where the goddess partakes of both angel and devil. With the Renaissance, Fortuna comes into her own again as goddess of chance.

Dr. Patch gives a compendium of the forms, attributes, and activities of Fortuna as set forth in the literature of the Middle Ages, the period with which his study chiefly concerns itself, and follows with a full consideration of her functions and cults (the Fortune of Love, Fortuna the Guide, Fortune of the Sea, the Fortune of Combat, the Fortune of Fame, Personal Fortuna, Fortuna Publica, the Fortune of Time, the Fortune of Death). Her dwelling, sometimes wholly sumptuous, sometimes partly squalid, is situated on a lofty island cliff, exposed to the soft breathing of Zephyr as well as to the blasts of Boreas. Its garden contains trees, some fruitful and some barren, and two streams, one sweet and one bitter. Fortuna's most important attribute, the wheel, functions variously. Sometimes she turns it, sometimes she is turned upon it. In the former case, four human figures are often pictured, or described, as bound to the wheel and revolving with it; sometimes a human figure is stretched across its face.

Dr. Patch concludes his able and extensive study with a consideration of the problem of the actual survival of the Goddess Fortuna in the Middle Ages, and finds the evidence (continued vitality and a growing symbolism) affirmative on this point.

STANLEY L. GALPIN.

Trinity College, Hartford.

Wilhelm Müller als Kritiker und Erzähler, von HEINRICH LOHRE.
Pp. 401. Leipzig, F. A. Brockhaus, 1927.

According to its preface, this important work appears in response to a plea contained in *Modern Language Notes* (February 1915) for an edition of Wilhelm Müller's letters addressed to the publisher, F. A. Brockhaus, and his son Heinrich. They were somewhat jealously guarded for a century in the archives of the Leipzig firm, but were given to the world last September, in this handsome volume issued in commemoration of the centenary of Wilhelm Müller's death.

The book opens with a new and comprehensive biography of the poet, occupying some hundred pages. It witnesses to prodigious research on Professor Lohre's part, and the results can leave no doubt that he was the scholar best fitted to undertake the task. He possesses a happy gift of combination, a sprightly, trenchant, compact style, disclosing broad culture and illumined by apt allusions; he analyzes thoroughly Müller's work as critic and political writer. The poet, whose special place in the hearts of the people may well be regarded as secure, is never idealized, but treated with rare honesty by this exceedingly level-headed biographer.

The biography gives a far more vivid and complete picture of Müller's life than has been heretofore possible—more especially the new pictures of boyhood days in Dessau; there are some new aspects of Müller's married life, which lend it a more romantic atmosphere than before.

The scarcity of letters from the poet makes this large addition very welcome, especially as nearly all of them have to do directly with Müller's literary activities. Some 162 letters are addressed to Brockhaus and his son; 8 to the Swedish poet Atterbom, and 21 (mostly new) to other friends and literary correspondents.

The correspondence with the Leipzig publisher took its beginning from a letter written by F. A. Brockhaus in December 1819, inviting Müller to furnish reviews for the journal *Hermes*. The literary connection thus begun lasted until the day of Müller's death in 1827. The poet wrote many reviews, covering the widest fields of contemporary literature, for Brockhaus's *Literarisches Conversationsblatt* (later re-named *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*), and contributed largely to the calendar *Urania*, and the *Conversations-Lexicon*. Brockhaus was also the publisher of Müller's two collections of *Neue Lieder der Griechen* and of his *Neueste Lieder* and *Lyrische Reisen*.

The tone of these letters is frank and unassuming, on the basis of mutual respect—relieved by easy pleasantries. On one occasion only, when Müller was urging the publication of a new pamphlet of *Songs of the Greeks*, was there any sign of serious friction. It

may safely be assumed that the problem of censorship made Brockhaus unwilling to undertake the venture, though he based his refusal very bluntly on the small value of Müller's offering. The correspondence sheds interesting new light on Rückert, Schwab and Tieck. At the end of the book are printed a number of valuable first-hand documents connected with important incidents in Müller's life.

The figure which defines itself with new distinctness out of these outlines loses none of its acknowledged charm, although it is clear that Müller's actual world became rather that of books than of spontaneous poetic creation. His very large production in literary criticism is creditable, though hampered by many distracting duties—as teacher and ducal librarian, editor of older poets, contributor to encyclopaedias, and director of court theatricals. With Lohre's final verdict, few will disagree: Müller reached his highest place when writing comparatively simple lyrics in the spirit of the *Volkslied*; "into the profoundest depths of the human soul he never penetrated"—a fact which by no means detracts from the winsomeness and freshness and spontaneity of his popular verse.

The book contains a newly-discovered but highly depressing portrait of the year 1817; we believe that no more satisfactory picture than that drawn by Wilhelm Hensel in 1822 exists.

Professor Lohre's work shows both untiring research and conscientious accuracy in detail. On page 76 the word "wolfe" should read "wolf"; the name "Fauriel" appears as "Fauviel" on page 314. The statement that Müller's worthy father exhibited "nur die treue Sorge um Äusseres" is contradicted by more than one entry in Müller's intimate *Diary* (University of Chicago Press, 1903). The circumstances of the poet's death were quite differently related by the veteran Geheimrat Hosaus of Dessau, who was certainly well-instructed as to events in the court-circles of Anhalt. There are grounds for suspecting that the widow and Gustav Schwab re-arranged the facts for personal reasons. Possibly a little fuller statement as to Franz Lieber's life in the United States (page 382) might be illuminating: he was "professor in Columbia (S. C.) U. S. A.", but he later became professor in Columbia College in the city of New York.

On page 18 Müller's early poem *Gleich und Glerch* is mentioned as "verloren." One of the many interesting exhibits at the recent splendid Müller Centenary in Dessau was the manuscript of this poem, which came to light during the search for materials illustrating his life. By the kindness of Bibliotheksrat Dr. Paul Wahl, I am able to present the text, which the Diary shows to have been written on October 17, 1815:

Es war einmal ein Rittersmann, Juchhe!
Der sah ein schönes Fräulein an, O weh!

Und flugs sprach er: Ich liebe dich, Juchhe!
 Und flugs sprach sie, Das dauert mich, O weh!
 Du Ritter schön und lobesam, Juchhe!
 Ich hab' schon einen Brautigan, O weh!
 Der Ritter sprach: O Freudenlaut, Juchhe!
 Auch ich, mein Kind, hab' eine Braut, O weh!
 Da sang die Maid: O Lauf der Welt, Juchhe!
 Seht, wie sich Gleich und Gleich gesellt, O weh!
 Der dieses Liedchen hat erdacht, Juchhe!
 Hatt' gern einmal dabei gelacht, O weh!
 Doch wenn er jauchzt in wilder Lust, Juchhe!
 Da seufzt es nach aus tiefer Brust, O weh!

Northwestern University

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

On Ten Plays of Shakespeare. Ten More Plays of Shakespeare.

By STOPFORD BROOKE. Oxford University Press, American Branch. New York: 1927. 2 vols.

The reprint by the Oxford Press of Stopford Brooke's essays on Shakespeare may encourage the hope that contemporary interest in the greatest of English poets is not wholly absorbed in textual criticism, theatrical companies, and the staging of Elizabethan plays. At least the rigors of research may be pleasantly relieved by turning now and then to an older criticism which found play not in scholarly puzzles but in sympathetic understanding of what lies at the heart of great books. To this criticism of sympathy and unfailing gusto belongs the Irishman Stopford Brooke. His literary work was only one of many expressions of his vitality. To his friends he was doubtless less the critic than the sometime chaplain to the Queen, who made bold in 1880 to secede from the communion of the Church of England. He belonged to a family that had transmitted its ancestral heroism by "preaching the Word of God to six generations of Irishmen." It was thus by inheritance and ancient right that he himself became "the impassioned preacher of Bedford Chapel." But he found time for other occupations and interests. For example, he was both a devoted student of the famous painter, Turner, and a moving spirit in the progressive Bedford Chapel Debating Society. In literature he produced successively, besides his books on Shakespeare, the Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, Theology in the English Poets, a classic Primer of English Literature, a famous History of Early English Literature, a Study of Tennyson, and a volume on the Poetry of Robert Browning. His subject, whatever it might be, was for Stopford Brooke a matter quite personally important. Accordingly in the volumes here noticed, as in all his criticism, there is for better or for worse what Mr. Jacks describes as "a strong reflection of his own inner life,"—an expression of the principle, "My joy shall be in you."

H. S. V. JONES.

BRIEF MENTION

Der Lautbestand des südmittenglischen Octavian, verglichen mit seinen Entsprechungen im Lybeaus Desconus und im Launfal. By ERNA FISCHER. Anglistische Forschungen, 63, Heidelberg, 1927. This dissertation is a valuable contribution to the study of Middle English philology, for it adds a precise and scholarly linguistic analysis of three Middle English poems to that slowly growing body of studies of individual literary documents, upon which reposes the surety of our understanding of the history of the English language. Dr. Fisher has not so much opened a new field in her study of the *Octavian*, as she has gone over an old one in the light of recent discoveries, and with the aid of the most modern technique. Sarazin, in 1885, published a study and edition of the two Middle English versions of the *Octavian*, and determined in general their linguistic character and literary affinities. Dr. Fischer's re-examination of the southern *Octavian* has resulted in a modification of the opinion held concerning the date of composition and the language of the poem. She rejects Sarrazin's external evidence, and, relying wholly on linguistic criteria, holds that the second, rather than the first, half of the fourteenth century was the period of composition. Sarrazin had identified the language of the *Octavian* as Southeastern and Kentish; Fischer, however, would look for the home of the poet in Essex, with the suggestion that, for a still closer localization, one might consider the northern part of Essex as a possibility.

As to the ascription of the three poems to Thomas Chestre, according to the Sarrazin-Kaluza hypothesis, Dr. Fischer is very cautious. She holds that although neither the probable date of composition nor the linguistic character of the poems stands in the way of their being the work of the same poet, yet, in the absence of any external evidence, no positive solution of the problem is possible.

RUDOLPH WILLARD.

A Handbook of English Intonation. By LILIAS E. ARMSTRONG and IDA C. WARD. Cambridge (Eng.), W. Heffer and Sons, 1926. Pp. vi + 124, 5 sh. There is space only to notice this useful little book by two members of the department of Phonetics in University College, London. The study of "intonation as an element of speech has," as the authors say, "been generally neglected"; mainly, no doubt, because it is far more difficult to analyze and describe than sounds. Yet it is obviously equally important; indeed, the much advertised differences between English and American speech are

far less differences in sounds than differences in pitch and sentence melody. In the present handbook the writers have analyzed the chief pitch patterns of the cultivated speech of the south of England and illustrated them graphically by means of an extremely ingenious system of transcription. The book is intended chiefly for foreign students of English, as a means of helping them to acquire a "correct pronunciation"; but the phonetician, too, will find it of great interest and importance, not least the American phonetician. To the latter, of course, it will be not a guide but a basis of comparison; and no doubt the authors would agree that the most valuable fruit of their own work would be a similar handbook of American intonation.

M. B. RUUD.

The Sea in English Literature. By ANNE TRENEER. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926. 10s. 6d. A book bearing such a title arouses suspicion. for it is likely to be either an academic treatise—in which case one fears an interminable catalogue of sea pieces held together by banal connectives, or the pleasant chatter of some literary gentleman on a subject much too good for him. Miss Treneer's book is none of these. It is a solid piece of scholarship, distinguished alike by exquisite taste and really illuminating criticism. She has traced the literature of the sea in English from *Beowulf* to the Elizabethans, and if she has declined to follow the theme further, it is not because of lack of interest or knowledge, as her felicitous use of modern writers proves abundantly, but because she must fix a term somewhere. The materials are overwhelming, but Miss Treneer has selected and ordered them admirably. Indeed, the arrangement is almost mechanically precise—the general periods, types of writing, the various authors, but so fascinating are the illustrative specimens that the skeleton is never obtrusive. I should like to single out two chapters—the first, "The Sea in Old English Literature," where Miss Treneer's thoroughly successful translations illustrate perfectly her sensitive and discriminating criticism of Old English poetry; and the third, written with a fine gusto, on Hakluyt's voyages, that will send many a reader to those incomparable "Navigations, Voiages, and Discoveries of the English Nation." This is popularization of knowledge of the right sort.

M. B. RUUD.

Literary Aims and Art. By HARRISON R. STEEVES. Silver, Burdett and Company, New York: 1927. In no more than 235 pages Professor Steeves has undertaken to deal with the aims and art of prose fiction, the drama, poetry, the essay and related prose

forms. To prose fiction he has devoted 47 pages; to drama 77; to poetry of all kinds, 65; and to the essay and prose forms 17. These proportions were determined, one suspects, by some consideration other than the relative interest or importance of the several topics. Certainly the justification of the book is to be sought less in its arrangement than in its helpful suggestions, of a kind that Professor Steeves and other thoughtful teachers of English must have imparted from time to time to their undergraduate students. To those teachers or students who are at a loss for ideas might be recommended particularly the 47 pages on fiction and the 77 on dramatic literature. Here can be found useful discrimination and analyses with an occasional shrewd comment upon the fictionist's or the playwright's art. Such unity as the book under review possesses should be sought in the initial chapter on First Considerations. Here the author deals sensibly, if hurriedly, with such perennial topics as Reading and Experience, Literature and Life, Realism and Romanticism. In general it would seem that a scattered and attenuated interest is a fault inherent in the plan and scope of Professor Steeves's *Literary Aims and Art*. Given the limits of his book, he might well have reconsidered its arrangement with a view to a greater originality and centrality.

H. S. V. JONES.

Henrik Ibsen, Et Diktarliv, by HALVDAN KOHT. Oslo, Aschehoug, 1928. This biography, of which the first part (1828-1866) has just appeared, is the Ibsen Book of the centenary year. Since Henrik Jaeger's biography, issued with Ibsen's authorization in 1888, nothing has been written that deserves the name of a new life of Ibsen. Reich, Lothar, Woerner, Moses, Gosse, Collin, and even Gran (1918) base their works on Jaeger, as well as on the letters and posthumous writings made accessible through the excellent editing done in the main by Koht, who is a native of Ibsen's birthplace and has for decades been acquainted with the members of the poet's family. In collecting Ibsen's letters he corresponded with practically all the persons with whom Ibsen had had contacts. He also met Ibsen himself, though at a time when the aged poet was no longer in full mental vigor. The four decades that have elapsed since the publication of the "official" biography have made possible a free discussion of a number of subjects; for example Ibsen's relation to his family or his illegitimate child of the Grimstad days. K.'s main thesis, propounded with deep understanding, is that Ibsen is above all a poet and that he never wrote anything that he had not experienced fully in his inner life. To all students of Ibsen this book and the forthcoming second part will be of immense value.

A. E. ZUCKER.

Matthew Arnold and Goethe. By JAMES BENTLEY ORRICK. Publications of the English Goethe Society, New Series, Vol. iv. London, 1928. Pp. 54. The often quoted line in the Memorial Verses about "Europe's sagest head" is an apt resumé of Matthew Arnold's attitude to Goethe: Goethe the sage appealed to him far more than Goethe the poet and man of genius. "Matthew Arnold never valued Goethe primarily as an artist," to quote Mr. Orrick. There is not one work of Goethe that meets with the wholehearted approval of the Midvictorian classicistic critic, as Mr. Orrick shows from ample quotations. Something might have been made of Arnold's silence. If he cared little for Tasso and Iphigenie, what would he have said about the Roman Elegies, the poems in free verse or die Wahlverwandtschaften? This strange lover of the Greeks most likely would have found the Elegies too pagan!

And the critic Goethe? "Matthew Arnold makes Goethe's love of Greek art and form a mere prop for his own classicism," Mr. Orrick most aptly states. Arnold the eclectic seeks support for his views in all quarters and adapts Goethe to his own ends. When he quotes Goethe on Lord Byron ("alles Grosse bildet") he carefully omits the words as Mr. Orrick points out: "Wir müssen uns hüten es [i. e. das Grosse] stets im entschieden Reinen und Sittlichen suchen zu wollen." He takes an idea or a part of an idea from Goethe here and there, but does not have any adequate conception of the totality of Goethe. To speak metaphorically, he takes a delectable plum that suits his palate, but lacks the vigor necessary to attack the whole pudding. If Matthew Arnold had an adequate conception of the totality of Goethe, he would have turned wholeheartedly against him.

Mr. Orrick's essay amply repays a careful reading, even though the author at times stops before the goal is reached: more might have been made of the numerous quotations. A certain naiveté is apparent when the author assumes that the words of Wilhelm Meister that a poet must live solely for his art express Goethe's own view. And what shall one say of this statement, "Goethe's style is assuredly on the whole eminently satisfying"? I cannot accept the hypothesis that Carlyle is responsible for Matthew Arnold's attitude to Goethe, which forms the closing argument of Mr. Orrick's study. Such outside influences never strike to the core of the matter: the real determining factor is Matthew Arnold himself, his personality, his point of view, his peculiar bent.

FRIEDRICH BRUNS.

University of Wisconsin.

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
A or An	98	Aubignac, L'Abbé d', La Prati-	
Acta Philologica Scandinavica .	196	tique du Théâtre	130
Actors, Child —	199	Audovera, Fredegundis and — .	94
Adaptations, English, of French		<i>Auserlesenen Gedichten</i>	153
Drama	87		
Adjectives and Adverbs in -lic		Balderston, K. C.: H. J. Smith,	
(-lice)	203	Oliver Goldsmith's <i>The Citizen</i>	
Adverbs, Adjectives and — in		<i>of the World</i> ; R. S.	
-lic (-lice)	203	Crane, New Essays by Oliver	
<i>Agrippa's Shadows</i>	325	Goldsmith	403
Aldington, R., Mr. Adlington		Balderston, Katherine C., The	
Replies	114	History and Sources of	
Alpern, Hyman, Guillén de		Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith</i>	405
Castro y Bellvis, <i>La Tragedia</i>		Baldwin, T. W.: S. A. Tannen-	
<i>por los celos</i>	58	baum, <i>The Booke of Sir</i>	
<i>Amadas et Ydoine</i>	268	Thomas Moore	327
America and French Culture,		—, The Organization and	
1750-1848	340	Personnel of the Shakespear-	
American in England, The . . .	556	ean Company	199
An, A or —	98	Ballads and Ballad Airs	280
Anderson, Jesse M., a Note on		— and Songs of the Shanty-	
the Date of <i>Winnere and</i>		Boy	51
<i>Wastoure</i>	47	Balor with the Evil Eye	558
Andrews, A. L.: G. T. Flom,		Balzac's <i>Illusions Perdues</i>	179
The Borgarthing Law of the		— <i>Les Employés</i>	236
Codex Tunsbergensis	72	Barock und Rokoko in der	
—, Old Norse Notes	166	deutschen Dichtung	408
Anglo-Dutch Relations from the		Baroness Knorring's <i>The Peas-</i>	
Earliest Times to the Death		<i>ant and his Landlord</i>	523
of William III	210	Barret, P., Shakespeare's Para-	
Annals of the New York Stage .	123	phrase of his <i>Thought-Ewe-</i>	
Années de jeunesse et le <i>Conte</i>		<i>cuting Fires</i>	316
<i>du Tonneau, Les</i>	211	Batho, Edith C., The Ettrick	
Anthology of Seventeenth Centu-		Shepherd	263
ry French Literature	71	Baudelaire, Charles	181
Argensola, Bartolomé Leonardo		Baum, P. F.: R. D. French, A	
de	163	Chaucer Handbook; G. H.	
Armstrong, Liliás E., and Ida		Cöwling, Chaucer; W. C.	
C. Ward, A Handbook of Eng-		Curry, Chaucer and the Me-	
lish Intonation	537	diaeval Sciences; K. Sisam,	
Arnold, Matthew, and Goethe .	570	Chaucer's <i>The Nun's Priest's</i>	
Arthur of Britain	481	<i>Tale</i>	206
Ascoli, Georges, La Grande-Bre-		Beaumont and Fletcher	22
tagne devant l'opinion fran-		Beaumont, C. W., The History	
çaise depuis la guerre de cent		of Harlequin	489
ans jusqu'à la fin du XVIe		Bedeutungsgleichheit der Alten-	
siècle	49	glischen Adjektiva und Ad-	
Ashton, H., A Preface to		verbia mit und ohne -lic	
Molière	212	(-lice)	203
<i>Astrée, L'</i>	134	Beiträge zur Untersuchung der	
Astrological Works of Abraham		literarischen und stofflichen	
Ibn Ezra	193	Quellen von Immermann's	
		Münchhausen	125

	PAGE		PAGE
Bennett, R. E., A Note on the Cyrano-Swift Criticism.	96	Breul, K., The Romantic Move- ment in German Literature	486
Bense, J. F., Anglo-Dutch Rela- tions from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third	210	<i>Briefe an Tieck</i>	459
Benson, A. B., Baroness Knor- ring's <i>The Peasant and His Landlord</i>	523	Briefe von C. F. Meyer, Betsy Meyer und J. Hardmeyer Jenny	144
<i>Beowulf</i> , Translated into Mod- ern English Rhyming Verse.	54	Broken sword theme	534
Bernbaum, E., Professor Bern- baum Rebutts	115	Brooke, S., On Ten Plays of Shakespeare	566
—, Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800	416	Brown, Beatrice D., A Study of the Middle English Poem Known as the <i>Southern Pas- sion</i>	63
Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval	411	Browning, Robert	550
Bibliography of Churchill	30	Browning's Parleyings	552
— of Keats	393	— Sources of the <i>Ring</i> and the <i>Book</i>	445
Bickersteth, G. L., Leopardi and Wordsworth	538	— <i>The Ring and the Book</i>	357
Blake's Mysticism	538	Bruns, F., Das Wort <i>Physio- logisch</i> bei Goethe	464
Blankenagel J. C. Franziska Fuller, Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen	67	—: James Bentley Orrick, Matthew Arnold and Goethe	570
Blondheim, D. S.: Louis Brandin, <i>La Chanson d'Aspre- mont</i> , d'après un poème du XIII ^e siècle	497	Bryan, W. F.: E. Weekley, Sur- names; Romance of Words; G. P. Krappe, Knowledge of English; R. E. Zachrisson, Pronunciation at Shake- speare's Time; G. C. van Langenhove, Origin of the Gerund in English	478
—, Some Recent American Editions of Old French Texts	266	Bryskett, Lodowick	183
Boas, G.: H. W. Wells, The Realm of Literature	281	Buck, H., <i>A Roderick Random</i> Play, 1748	111
Boas, R. P.: Mary Ellen Chase, Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel	356	Burgum, E. B.: A Von Helm- holtz-Phelan, The Social Phi- losophy of William Morris	548
Boesche, A. W.: H. W. Nord- meyer, Eduard Fitzgeralds <i>Rubaiyat des Omar Khay- yam</i>	197	Burlesque, A Triple —	312
Bond, D. F., <i>The Essay on Man</i> , Epistle II, Lines 31-34	326	Burns's Language	511
Bond, R. P., A Triple Burlesque	312	Bush, D., Musaeus in English Verse	101
Rooke of Sir Thomas Moore, <i>The</i>	327	Cædmonian Manuscript	304
Borgarthing Law of the Codex Tunsbergensis	72	Calculus of Variants, The	283
Bowyer, J. W., Susanna Free- man Centlivre	78	Callaway, M., Jr.: K. Uhler, Die Bedeutungsgleichheit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (-lice)	203
Boylesve, René	41	Calogrenanz and Crestien's Originality	215
Bracegirdle, Mrs —'s acting	390	Cambiaire, C. P., Poe en France	493
Bragg, Marion K., The Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth-Cen- tury England	213	<i>Campaspe</i> of Lyly	325
Brandin, Louis, <i>La Chanson</i> <i>d'Aspremont</i> , d'après un poème du XIII ^e siècle	497	Campbell, K.: C. P. Cambiaire, Poe en France	493
		Campbell, O. J.: F. W. Stokoe, German Influence in the Eng-	

INDEX

573

PAGE

PAGE

lish Romantic Period 1788-1818	262	Chase, Mary Ellen, Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel	356
Carey, Millicent Beatrice D. Brown, A Study of the Middle English Poem Known as the <i>Southern Passion</i>	63	Chaucer and the Medieval Sciences	206
Carnoy, A, La Science du Mot	186	— and Wordsworth.	104
Carrière, J. M.: L-P Geoffrion, Zigzags autour de nos parlers	342	— Concordance	332
—: Sándor Kémeri, Rambles with Anatole France.	194	—, Handbook, A	206
Carus, K. G., Letter to.	308	Chaucer's <i>holy Jewes shepe</i>	536
—, and Ludwig Tieck	73	Chaucer, O. E. Verse in —.	234
Case, A. E., The Model for Pope's Verses <i>To the Author of a Poem Intituled "Successio"</i>	321	Chaucer's <i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i>	206
Case of Predicate Complement	11	— <i>The Parson's Tale</i>	229
Caskey, J. H., The Life and Works of Edward Moore.	399	— Yeoman.	176
<i>Castigo del discreto, El</i>	310	Chazin, M.: H. M. Jones, America and French Culture, 1750-1848	340
Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection bequeathed by Willard Fiske. Additions 1913-26	350	Chevalley, A.: W. C. Frierson, L'influence du Naturalisme français sur les Romanciers anglais	547
Cawley, R. R., George Gascoigne and the Siege of Fama-gusta	296	Child Actors, The.	199
Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800	212	<i>Christ and Satan</i>	108
Centlivre, Susanna Freeman.	78	Christ, Stanzaic Life of.	475
Chambers, E. K., Arthur of Britain	481	Churchill, Charles	30
Chandler, Elizabeth L., Study of the Sources of the Tales and Romances Written by Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853	143	Clubb, M. D., The Second Book of the <i>Cædmonian Manuscript</i>	304
Chandler, F. W.: E. B. Watson, Sheridan to Robertson, A Study of the Nineteenth-Century London Stage.	121	Codex Tunsbergensis.	72
<i>Chanson d'Aspremont, La</i> , d'après un poème du XIIIe siècle	497	Coffman, G. R.: C. H. Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.	336
<i>Chanson de Roland, La</i>	266	Cohen, G., Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Age.	484
<i>Chansons de Geste</i>	84	Coleridge Marginalia	182
Chapman, C. O., <i>The Parson's Tale: a Mediaeval Sermon</i>	229	—, Two Unpublished Letters of.	375
Chapman, P., L. Cons, L. Levengood, W. Vreeland. An Anthology of Seventeenth Century French Literature.	71	Comedy, low, in English drama	66
Chapman's <i>Eastward Ho.</i> 28, 324		Commedia dell' arte, La.	489
Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare, A. Polesworth in Arden.	144	<i>Commentaire historique</i> of Voltaire	439
		Concordance to the Works of Chaucer	332
		Cons, L.: D. Mornet, la Nouvelle Héloïse.	560
		—: G. Cohen, Le Théâtre en France au Moyen Age.	484
		Cooper, L., A Note on " <i>Eastward Ho.</i> " I, ii, 178.	324
		Cornarius, Janus.	223
		Correspondence of H. C. Robinson	538
		— of Shelley.	208
		Cortés, A., La Muerte del Conde de Villamediana.	553
		Costume, women's in French Texts	69

	PAGE		PAGE
Court Masque, The . . .	492	Date of <i>Winnere and Wastoure</i>	47
Cowley, Abraham, Letters of . .	369	<i>Deutscher Merkur</i>	91
Cowling, G. H., Chaucer	206	DeVane, W. C., Browning's Par-	
Crane, R. S., F. B. Kaye, and		leyings	552
M. E. Prio., A Census of		Dickman, A.-J., <i>Le temps est</i>	
British Newspapers and Pe-		<i>un songe et l'Intersigne de</i>	
riodicals, 1820-1800	212	Villiers	531
—, New Essays by Oliver		Dialect of Penrith.	412
Goldsmith	403	<i>Dialogus inter Militem et Cleri-</i>	
Crashaw's Poems	275	<i>cum</i> by John Trevisa	475
Crawford, J. P. W., A Cortés,		Dictionary of Danish . . .	349
La Muerte del Conde de Vil-		Donne's Early Reading	318
lamaniana	553	— Prose Works	275
<i>Crestanje (-nic?) bodel and</i>		Doppeldrucke	1
<i>bodel saccher</i>	529	— der Goethe-Ausgabe 1806.	245
Crestien de Troye.	215	— von Wielands <i>Auserlesenen</i>	
Critical Medley, A Essays,		<i>Gedichten</i>	153
Studies, and Notes in Eng-		— von Wielands <i>Deutschem</i>	
lish, French, and Compara-		<i>Merkur</i>	91
tive Literature	213	Dorset's <i>To Mr. Edward How-</i>	
Criticism. Cyano-Swift —	96	<i>ard</i>	321
—, Textual —	283	Douglas, T. W., What is the	
Croftis, J., Gray, Poetry and		<i>Parlement of Foules?</i> . .	378
Prose, with Essays by John-		Doyle, H. G., F. B. Luquiens,	
son, Goldsmith, and others	213	Introduction to Old French	
Crooks, Esther J. Guillén de		Phonology and Morphology.	190
Castro y Bellvis, <i>La Trage-</i>		Drama and Novel of Kleist. .	67
<i>dia por los celos</i>	58	—, British.	207
Cross, T. P., H. R. Plomer and,		—, Low Comedy in English.	66
The Life and Correspondence		—, Sir Thomas More's View	
of Lodowick Bryskett	183	of	294
Crowne's <i>Justice Busy</i>	390	Dramatic Piracy.	256
Culture, French — and America	340	Dumas, Adolphe, un poète bil-	
Cunhiffe, J. W., Modern English		ingue	354
Playwrights	402	Dustoor, P. E., Notes on the	
Curry, W. C., Chaucer and the		E. E. T. S. Edition of the New-	
Medieval Sciences	206	castle <i>Noah's Ark</i>	252
Cyrano de Bergerac	96	Dutch Historical Grammar . .	352
Dahlerup, V., Oudbog over det		Eastward Ho, I, ii, 178. . . .	28
danske Spog.	349	<i>Eastward Ho, I, vi</i> 178. . . .	324
Dale, G. I. A Second Source of		<i>Edward VI.</i>	104
Lope's <i>El Castigo del discipulo</i>	310	Einarsson, S., Acta Philologica	
Danish Dictionary	349	Scandinavica	196
Danton, G. H., Germany Ten		— E. W. Gordon, An Intro-	
Years After	347	duction to Old Norse.	542
Dargan, E. P., W. A. Nitze and,		—: Festschrift til Hjalmar	
A History of French Litera-		Falk	490
ture from the earliest times		E. K.'s Elf < <i>Guelph</i> , <i>Göblin</i> <	
to the present	211	<i>Ghibelline</i>	249
Dargan, H. M., E. Pons, Swift,		Elegiac Distich in German. . .	247
Les années de jeunesse et le		<i>Elegy</i> of Gray.	442
<i>Conte du Tombeau</i>	211	<i>Elf</i> < <i>Guelph</i>	249
— H. Teerink, The History		Elizabethan Public Playhouse. .	118
of John Bull	132	<i>Employés, Les</i>	236
Date of Spenser's Death. . . .	322	English, A Short History of —	496
— of the <i>Garlande of Laurell</i>	314	— Adaptations of French	
— of <i>The Noble Gentleman</i> . . .	22	Drama	87

	PAGE		PAGE
English, Fifteenth Century ..	338	Feise, E.: G. H. Danton, Ger-	
—, Knowledge of —.	478	many Ten Years Aiter . . .	347
—, Novelists.	547	—: Moeller van den Bruck,	
—, Playwrights	402	Goethe	55
—, Preachers and Preaching. .	545	Fess, G. M., <i>Les Employés</i> and	
—, Romantic Period	262	<i>Scènes de la vie bureau-</i>	
—, Satire and Satirists . . .	187	<i>cratique</i>	236
—, Verse.	101	Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk .	490
Epigrammatists, Early English	223	Fiction and Fantasy in German	
Ermatinger, E., Barock und		Romance	486
Rokoko in der deutschen		—, Prose — Before 1800 . .	416
Dichtung	408	Fiedler, H. G., Das Oxforder	
<i>Essay on Man</i>	429	Buch Deutscher Dichtung .	286
— on <i>Man</i> , Epistle II, Lines		Field, Nathaniel.	112
31-34	326	Fifteenth Century English .	338
Essays in Memory of Barrett		Figure de Saul et sa représen-	
Wendell	496	tation dans la littérature	
—, New — by Oliver Gold-		dramatique française. . . .	285
smith	403	First English Translation of	
Estampas de la vida en León .	273	<i>Werther</i>	467
Estats et Empires de la Lune		Fischei, Erna, Der Lautbestand	
et do Soleil, Les	96	des sudmittelenglischen Oc-	
Etat présent des études rabe-		tavian, verglichen mit seinen	
laisesiennes	356	Entsprechungen im Lybeaus	
Ettrick, Shepherd, The . . .	263	Desconus und im Launfal . .	567
<i>Euphues</i>	537	Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat of Omar	
<i>Europe littéraire, L'</i> (1833-		Khayyam	197
1834)	409	Flaubert's Youth	269
<i>Eve of St. Agnes</i> , The.	38	Flom, G. K.: P. H. Reaney, A	
Exempelen, Middelnederlandse		Grammar of the Dialect of	
Legenden en	61	Penrith	412
Ezra, Abraham Ibn	193	—, The Borgarthung Law of	
Faber, G. C., The Poetical		the Codex Tunsbergensis . .	72
Works of John Gay.	143	Foerster, N.: A. E. Powell	
<i>Faerie Queene</i>	80	(Mrs. E. R. Dodds), The Ro-	
Falk, Hjalmar, Festskrift til —	490	matic Theory of Poetry.	258
Falstaff	278	Fogg, W. G., OE. <i>mæzep</i> in	
Famagusta, Siege of	296	<i>Hah Merdenhad</i>	527
Fantasy, Fiction and — of Ger-		Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth-	
man Romance.	436	Century England, The. . . .	213
Feise, E.: Briefe von C. F.		Fortuna	563
Meyer, Betsy Meyer und J.		Foster, F. A., A Stanzaic Life	
Hardmeyer-Jenny, herausge-		of Christ.	475
geben von O. Schulthess . .	144	France, Anatole	194
—: E. Ermatinger, Barock		—, Anatole.	344
und Rokoko in der deutschen		Frank, Grace Eunice R. God-	
Dichtung	408	dard, Women's Costume in	
—: F. von der Leyen, Ge-		French Texts of the Eleventh	
schichte der deutschen Dich-		and Twelfth Centuries.	69
tung	140	Frau, die, in Kleists Dramen	
—: Fiedler, H. G., Das Ox-		und Novellen.	67
forder Buch Deutscher Dich-		Fredegundis and Audovera. .	94
tung	286	French Culture.	340
—: G. C. L. Schuchard,		— Drama	87
Studien zur Verskunst des		— Literature, Anthology of. .	71
jungen Klopstock.	202	— Source of <i>The Rules of</i>	
		<i>Civility</i>	17

	PAGE		PAGE
French Texts of Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries . . .	69	Goethe-Doppeldrucke . . .	245
—, R. D., A Chaucer Handbook . . .	206	Goethe . . .	570
Frere, John Hookham, <i>The Monks and the Giants</i> . . .	142	Goethe, <i>Werther</i> . . .	36
Frierson, W. C., L'influence du Naturalisme français sur les Romanciers anglais . . .	547	—, Moeller van der Bruck . . .	55
Fuller, Franziska, Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen . . .	67	Goethe's Use of the Word <i>Physiologisch</i> . . .	464
Galpin, S. L.: H. R. Patch, <i>The Goddess Fortuna</i> . . .	563	— <i>Werther</i> . . .	467
<i>Garland of Laurell</i> . . .	314	Gohdes, C., A Note on the Bibliography of Keats . . .	393
Gainche, Christopher . . .	518	Goldsmith, New Essays of . . .	403
Gallod, H. W., Wordsworth . . .	205	—, Percy's Memoir of . . .	405
Gascoigne, George, and the Siege of Famagusta . . .	296	Goldsmith's <i>The Citizen of the World</i> . . .	403
Gay's Poetical Works . . .	143	Gordon, E. W., An Introduction to Old Norse . . .	542
Genesis of <i>The Ring and the Book</i> . . .	357	Gothic Particle <i>þau</i> . . .	242
Geoffrion, L.-P., Zigzags autour de nos papiers . . .	342	Grammar, Dutch . . .	352
German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1818 . . .	262	—, Spanish . . .	274
— Literature . . .	140	— of the Dialect of Penrith . . .	412
— Literature, Romantic Movement in — . . .	486	<i>Grand Signiors Seraglio, The</i> , by Robert Wilkins . . .	450
Germany Ten Years After . . .	347	Grande-Bretagne, La, devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin de XVIIe siècle . . .	49
Gerould, G. H.: A. J. Perry, <i>Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum</i> by John Trevisa; F. A. Foster, A Stanzonic Life of Christ; B. Wendell, The History of the Translation of the Martyrs . . .	475	Grandgent, C. H.: A. Carnoy, <i>La Science du Mot</i> . . .	186
Geund in English . . .	478	Gray, Arthur, A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare, Polesworth in Arden . . .	144
Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung . . .	140	—, Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Johnson, Goldsmith, and others . . .	213
<i>Ghibelline > Goblun</i> . . .	249	Gray's <i>Elegy</i> . . .	442
Giесе, William F., Victor Hugo. The Man and the Poet . . .	70	Green, O. H., Sources of Two Sonnets of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola . . .	163
Girard, H. et H. Moncel, Pour et contre le romantisme . . .	346	Greene, H. E.: F. T. Russell, One Word More on Browning . . .	550
<i>Goblun < Ghibelline</i> . . .	249	Greene, R. L., A Re-arrangement of <i>Christ and Satan</i> . . .	108
Goddard, Eunice R., Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries . . .	69	Greenlaw, E.: Evelyn M. Simpson, A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne; M. Praz, Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra: John Donne, Richard Crashaw; L. C. Martin, The Poems English, Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw, edited . . .	275
Goddess Fortuna . . .	563	—: H. R. Plomer and T. P. Cross, The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett . . .	183
Göke, N., Beiträge zur Untersuchung der literarischen und stofflichen Quellen von Immermann's <i>Münchhausen</i> . . .	125	Greg, W. W., The Calculus of Variants, an Essay on Textual Criticism . . .	283

PAGE	PAGE
Greig, G., Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs 280	Hench, A. L., Jefferson and Ossian 537
Gruffydd, W. J., Math Vab Mathonwy 558	Henning, G. N.: H. L. Stewart, Anatole France, the Parisian 344
<i>Guelph > Elf</i> 249	Hermannsson, H., Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Be- queathed by Willard Fiske. Additions 1913-26 350
Guillén de Castro y Bellvis, <i>La Tragedia por los celos</i> 58	<i>Hermann, IV, 1</i> 467
<i>Gullwer's Travels</i> 96	Herold, Amos L., James Kirke Paulding, versatile American 495
Hairy Anchorite Legend 271	Hesselgrave, Ruth Avaline, Lady Miller and the Bath- easton Literary Circle . . . 286
<i>Hali Meidenhad</i> 527	Heywood and the Popularizing of History 287
Handbook of English Intona- tion 567	Hill, R. H., The Shelley Corre- spondence in the Bodleian Li- brary 208
Hanford, J. H.: D. H. Stevens, Milton Papers 555	Hillebrand, H. N., The Child Actors 199
Hardy, Thomas, from Serial to Novel 356	Hillhouse, J. T., <i>A or An</i> . . . 98
Harlequin, History of 489	—, The Man of Taste 174
Harper, G. McL.: E. J. Morley, Correspondence of H. C. Rob- inson; G. L. Bickersteth, Leopardi and Wordsworth; H. C. White, The Mysticism of William Blake 538	Hirth, Friedrich, <i>Heinrich Heines Briefwechsel</i> 525
Hartl, Eduard, Die Textge- schichte des Wolframschen Parzival 285	Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée françaises contem- poraines 284
Haskins, C. H., The Renais- sance of the Twelfth Century 336	Historische Grammatik der nie- derländischen Sprache 352
Hatfield, J. T.: H. Lohre, W. Müller als Kritiker und Erzähler 564	History, Popularizing of —. 287
Havens, G. R., Voltaire's Margi- nal Comments upon Pope's <i>Essay on Man</i> 429	— and Sources of Percy's <i>Me- mour of Goldsmith</i> 405
Havens, R. D.: A Census of British Newspapers and Peri- odicals, 1620-1800 212	— of French Literature 211
—: F. McD. C. Turner, The Element of Irony in English Literature, An Essay 355	— of Harlequin 489
—: G. C. Faber, The Poetical Works of John Gay 143	— of John Bull 132
—: R. D. Waller, <i>The Monks and the Grants</i> , by John Hookham Frere 142	— of the Translation of the Martyrs 475
—: Ruth Avaline Hessel- grave, Lady Miller and the Bath-easton Literary Circle . 286	Hollander, L. M.: H. Her- mannsson, Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Be- queathed by Willard Fiske. Additions 1913-26 350
<i>Heines Briefwechsel</i> 525	Holmes, U. T., The Saracen Oath in the <i>Chansons de Geste</i> 84
Helmholtz-Phelan, A. Von, The Social Philosophy of William Morris 548	—: R. Levy, The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra 193
Heltzel, V. B., <i>The Rules of Civility</i> (1871) and its French Source 17	Holteis, <i>Briefe an Tieck</i> 459
	<i>Holy Jewes Shepe</i> in Chaucer . 536
	Hotson, Leslie: Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell. 496
	Howard, Leon: Elizabeth L. Chandler's Study of the Sources of the Tales and Ro- mances written by Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853 . . . 143

	PAGE		PAGE
Hughes, Helen S., Another Letter by Horace Walpole . . .	319	Kémeri, Sándor, Rambles with Anatole France	194
Hugo, Victor	70	Kennedy, A. G., J. S. P. Tatlock and, A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer	332
Hugo's <i>Hernani</i> , IV, 1	467	Kenrick, William, <i>Old Woman's Duncrad</i>	312
Hunlaßing	300	Kenyon, John S. Sir Richard Paget, Bart., The Nature of Human Speech	498
Hustvedt, S. B.: Katherine C. Baldeiston, The History and Sources of Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith</i>	405	Kihlhorn, A., A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I	338
Ibsen, Henrik	569	Kleist, Heinrich Von	67
Icelandic Collection	350	Klopstock—Originalausgabe . . .	384
<i>Illusions Perdus</i> , Stendhal's . .	179	Klopstock's Versification . . .	202
Imitation of <i>Faerie Queene</i> . .	80	Knowledge of English	478
Immeimann, Karl Lebrecht . . .	125	Koht, Halvdan, Henrik Ibsen, Eit Diktarliv	569
Impairfect in Portuguese . . .	468	Koszul, A.: W. E. Peck, Shelley, His Life and Work	498
Influence, L', du Naturalisme français sur les Romanciers anglais	547	Krappe, A. H., Balor with the Evil Eye	558
<i>Intersigne</i> , L'	531	—: C. G. N. De Vooy, Middelederlandse Legendes en Exempelen	61
Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology . .	190	—: The Valkyrie Episode in the <i>Njals Saga</i>	471
— to Old Norse	542	Krappe, E. S., A Note on Chaucer's Yeoman	176
Irish Parallel to the Broken Sword of the Grail Castle . .	534	Krappe, G. P., Knowledge of English	478
Irony in English Literature . .	375	Kurrelmeyer, W., Another Letter from Tieck to Carus . . .	308
Irving, W. H., An Imitation of the <i>Faerie Queene</i>	50	—, Doppeldrucke von Wielands <i>Auserlesenen Gedichten</i> . .	153
Jackson, J. H., Óðinn's Meetings with Sigmundr and Sigurðr in the <i>Volsungasaga</i> . .	307	—, Doppeldrucke von Wielands <i>Deutschem Merkur</i> . . .	91
Janus Cornarius's <i>Selecta Epigrammatica Graeca</i> and the Early English Epigrammatists	223	—: Eduard Hartl, Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival	285
Jefferson and Ossian	537	—, Eine Unbekannte Klopstock-Originalausgabe	384
Jeffreys's <i>Micrope</i>	561	—, Neue Wieland-Doppeldrucke	1
Jenkins, T. Atkinson, <i>La Chanson de Roland</i>	266	—, Zu den Doppeldrucken der Goethe-Ausgabe 1806. . .	245
John Bull, History of	132	Labé, Louise, Sa vie et son œuvre	212
Johnson, Samuel, Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34	Lady Miller and the Bath-easton Literary Circle	286
Jones, H. M.: America and French Culture, 1750-1848 . .	340	Lancaster, H. C.: A History of French Literature from the earliest times to the present, by W. A. Nitze and E. P. Dargan	211
Jones, H. S. V.: Harrison R. Steeves, Literary Aims and Art	568		
— S Brooke, On Ten Plays of Shakespeare	566		
Jordan, J. C., <i>The Eve of St. Agnes</i> and <i>The Lay of the Last Minstrel</i>	38		
<i>Justice Busy</i>	390		
Keats, Bibliography of — . . .	393		
—, <i>The Eve of St. Agnes</i> . . .	38		
Kelts, Romans, — and Saxons .	481		

INDEX

579

	PAGE		PAGE
Lancaster, H. C.: A Note on <i>Hernani</i> , IV, 1.	467	Letter from Tieck to Carus . . .	308
—: Georges Ascoli, La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du XVI ^e siècle	49	Letters of Abraham Cowley . .	369
—: Daniel Mornet, Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée françaises contemporaines	284	Letters, Two — of Coleridge . .	375
—: Dorothy O'Connor, Louise Labé, sa vie et son œuvre . .	212	Letters of Tobias Smollett, M. D.	138
—: H. Ashton, A Preface to Molière	212	Levy, R., The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra. . .	193
—: H. Vaganay, Honoré d'Urfé, <i>l'Astrée</i>	134	Leyen, F. von der, Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung . .	140
—: Jean Plattard, Etat présent des études rabelaisiennes	356	Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett	183
—: M. A. Thiel, La figure de Saul et sa représentation dans la littérature dramatique française	285	Life and Works of Edward Moore	399
—: M. Magendie, Du Nouveau sur <i>l'Astrée</i>	134	Life and Works of Shelley . .	394
—: P. Martino, L'Abbé d'Aubignac, la Pratique du Théâtre	130	Life of Christ	475
—: T. E. Oliver, The <i>Merope</i> of Jeffreys as a source of Voltaire's <i>Mérope</i>	561	Linguistic Studies.	499
Landré, Louis: Frédéric Mistral (neveu), Un poète bilingue: Adolphe Dumas (1806-1861)	354	Literary Aims and Art	568
Langenhove, Origin of the German in English.	478	Literature, German.	140
Language of Burns	511	Literature, French.	71
Lathrop, H. B., Janus Cornarius's <i>Selecta Epigrammata Græca</i> and the Early English Epigrammatists	223	Literature, Realm of —. . . .	281
Lautbestand des südmitteleuropäischen Octavian.	567	Lohre, H., Müller als Kritiker und Erzähler	564
Law, Borgarthing —	72	Loomis, R. S., Calogrenanz and Crestien's Originality	215
Lawrence, W. J., The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse; — Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. .	118	—: W. J. Gruffydd, Math Vab Mathonway; A. H. Krappe, Balor with the Evil Eye	558
<i>Lay of the Last Minstrel</i> , The. .	38	Lope's <i>El Castigo del discreto</i> .	310
Legenden en Exempelen, Middelederlandse	61	Low Comedy in English Drama. .	66
Lenormand's <i>Le Temps est un songe</i>	531	Lowell, Amy.	145, 152
Leopardi and Wordsworth. . .	538	Lowes, J. L., The Road to Xanadu	426
Letter by Horace Walpole. . . .	319	Luquiens, F. B., Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology	190
		Lyly's <i>Campaspe</i>	325
		Lyly's <i>Euphues</i>	537
		Mabbott, Thomas Ollive: Amos L. Herold, James Kirke Paulding versatile American. . . .	495
		<i>Macbeth</i> , Johnson's Edition of. .	34
		Maclean, Catherine M., Dorothy and William Wordsworth	265
		MacMillan, D.: G. C. D. Odell, Annals of the New York Stage	123
		Magendie, M., Du Nouveau sur <i>l'Astrée</i>	134
		Malone, K.: E. K. Chambers, Arthur of Britain; R. E. Zachrisson, Romans, Kelts and Saxons.	481
		—: E. Pons, Le Thème et le sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne. . .	406

	PAGE		PAGE
Malone, K.: <i>Hunlating</i> . . .	300	Michaud, G. L., <i>The Spanish Sources of certain Sixteenth-Century French Writers</i> . .	157
—, <i>Some Recent Linguistic Studies</i> . . .	499	Middelnederlandse Legendes en Exempelen . . .	61
—: V. Dahlerup, <i>Ordbog over det danske Sprog</i> . . .	349	Middle English Poem <i>The Southern Passion</i> . . .	63
Man of Taste, <i>The</i> . . .	174	Miles, L. W.: J. Postma, <i>Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists</i> . . .	353
Maiden, C. C., and F. C. Tarr, <i>A First Spanish Grammar</i> . .	274	Milton Papers. . .	555
Marie, Aristide, <i>Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Neval</i> . .	411	Milton's Appearance . . .	391
Marginal Comments of Voltaire	429	Mistral Frédéric (neveu), <i>Un poète bilingue Adolphe Dumas (1806-1861)</i> . . .	354
Marginalia, Coleridge's — . .	182	Model for Pope's Verses <i>To the Author of a Poem Intituled "Successio"</i> . . .	321
Martin, L. C., <i>The Poems English, Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw, edited</i> . .	275	Modern English Playwrights <i>mazep in Itali Merdenhad</i> . .	527
Martinengo, Count Nestore	296	Molière, A Preface to — . .	212
Martino, P., <i>L'Abbé d'Aubignac, la Pratique du Théâtre</i> . .	130	Moncel, H., H. Girard et, <i>Pour et contre le romantisme</i> . .	346
Martyrs, Translation of — . .	475	<i>Monks and the Giants, The</i> . .	142
Masque, <i>The Court</i> — . .	492	Monnier's <i>Scènes de la vie bureaucratique</i> . . .	236
Masques, Plays and — . .	492	Moore, Edward . . .	399
Math Vab Mathonwy . . .	558	More, Sir Thomas . . .	294
Maxwell, B., <i>The Date of The Noble Gentleman</i> . . .	22	Morley, E. J., <i>Correspondence of H. C. Robinson</i> . . .	538
McKillop, A. D.: Eric Partridge, <i>A Critical Medley: Essays, Studies, and Notes in English, French, and Comparative Literature</i> . .	213	Moinet, Daniel, <i>Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée françaises contemporaines, 1870-1925</i> . . .	284
—: J. Crofts, <i>Gray, Poetry and Prose, with Essays by Johnson, Goldsmith, and others</i> . .	213	Mornet, D., <i>la Nouvelle Héloïse</i> . .	560
—: Marion K. Bragg, <i>The Formal Eclogue in Eighteenth-Century England</i> . .	213	Morphology, O. F. Phonology and — . . .	190
—, <i>The First English Translator of Werther</i> . . .	36	Morris, William —'s <i>Social Philosophy</i> . . .	548
—, <i>The First English Translation of Werther</i> . . .	467	Muller, W., als Kritiker und Erzähler . . .	564
Mediaeval Sermon . . .	229	<i>Munchhausen</i> . . .	125
Meer, M. J. Van Der, <i>Histoische Grammatik der nederlândischen Sprache</i> . . .	352	Muerte del Conde de Villamediana . . .	553
<i>Memor of Goldsmith, Percy's</i> . .	405	Murdock, K. B.: R. E. Spiller, <i>The American in England</i> . .	556
Mennei, R. J.: J. S. P. Tatlock and A. G. Kennedy, <i>A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer</i> . .	332	Musaeus in English Verse . . .	101
Mercier, L.-S., et <i>l'Elegy de Gray</i> . . .	442	Mustard, W. P., <i>Agrippa's Shadows</i> . . .	325
<i>Merkur, Deutscher</i> . . .	91	—, <i>Note on Lyly's Euphuës</i> . .	537
<i>Merope</i> of George Jeffreys . .	561	Mysticism of William Blake . .	538
<i>Merope</i> of Voltaire . . .	561	Nachträge zu Holteis <i>Briefe an Treck</i> . . .	459
Meyer, C. F., <i>Letters of</i> . . .	144	Naturalism, French . . .	547
Mic, C., <i>La Commedia dell'Arte</i> . .	489	Nature in Anglo-Saxon Poetry . .	406
		Nature of Human Speech, <i>The</i> . .	498

PAGE

PAGE

Nerval, Gérard de, Bibliographie des œuvres de.	411
Nethercot, A. H., The Letters of Abraham Cowley	369
Neue Wieland-Doppeldrucke	1
New Essays by Oliver Gold- smith	403
New Light on the Genesis of <i>The Ring and the Book</i>	357
Nicoll, Allardyce: H. A. Wite, Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage; J. H. Casky, The Life and Works of Edward Moore; Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare Improved	399
Nineteenth-Century London Stage	121
Nitze, W. A. and E. P. Dargan, A History of French Litera- ture from the earliest times to the present.	211
Nitze, William A., <i>Le Roman de l'estoire dou Graal</i>	267
Njals Saga.	471
<i>Noah's Ark</i>	252
<i>Noble Gentleman, The</i>	22
Nock, S. A., Notes on Milton's Appearance	391
Nordmeyer, H. W., Eduard Fitzgeralds <i>Rubaiyat des Omar Khayyam</i>	197
Northup, C. S. A. H. Tolman, Falstaff and Other Shake- spearean Topics	278
Note in Johnson's Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34
Note on Baudelaire	181
Note on Burns's Language	511
Note on Chaucer's Yeoman	176
Note on Dramatic Piracy	256
Note on " <i>Eastward Ho</i> ," I, vi, 178, A.	324
Note on <i>Hernani</i> , IV, i.	467
Note on John Donne's Early Reading	318
Note on Lyly's <i>Euphues</i>	537
Note on <i>Parlement of the Thre Ages</i> , 38.	177
Note on the Bibliography of Keats	393
Notes on the Elegiac Distich in German	247
Note on the Gothic Particle <i>pau</i>	242
Note on Voltaire's <i>Conmen- taire historique</i>	439
Notes on Milton's Appearance	391

Notes on the E. E. T. S. Edition of the Newcastle <i>Noah's Ark</i>	252
Nouvelle Héloïse, La	560
Novel, Drama and — in Kleist.	67
Novelists, English	547
Noyes, E. S., The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M. D.	138
Noyes, R. G., Mrs. Brace- girdle's Acting in Crowne's <i>Justice Busy</i>	390
<i>Nun's Priest's Tale, The</i>	206
Oath, Saracen, in the <i>Chansons de Geste</i>	84
O'Connor Dorothy, Louise Labé, sa vie et son œuvre.	212
Odell, G. C. D., Annals of the New York Stage.	123
Old English Adverbs and Ad- jectives	203
Old English <i>mæȝeþ</i>	527
Old English Verse in Chaucer	234
Old French.	11
Old French <i>crestange</i> (<i>-me?</i>) <i>bodel</i> and <i>bodel sacelier</i>	529
Old French Phonology and Mor- phology	190
Old Norse, Introduction to	542
Old Norse Notes.	166
<i>Old Woman's Dunciad</i>	312
Oliphant, E. H. C., A Note	112
Oliver, T. E., The <i>Merope</i> of Jeffreys as a source of Vol- taire's <i>Mérope</i>	561
One word More on Browning	550
Ordbog over det danske Sprog.	349
Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy An- chorite	271
Origin of Gerund in English	478
Orrick, James Bentley, Matthew Arnold and Goethe.	570
Ossian, Jefferson and —	537
Oßinn's Meetings with Sig- mundr and Sigurðr in the <i>Völsungasaga</i>	307
Oxford Book of German Verse.	286

Paget, Sir Richard, The Nature of Human Speech	498
Palfrey, T. R., <i>L'Europe litté- raire</i> (1833-1834).	409
<i>Parlement of Foules</i>	378
<i>Parlement of the Thre Ages</i> , 38	177
Parodists of Tennyson.	353
<i>Parson's Tale, The</i>	229
Particle <i>pau</i> in Gothic.	242

	PAGE		PAGE
Partridge, Eric, A Critical Medley: Essays, Studies, and Notes in English, French, and Comparative Literature	213	Poe, E. A.	152
—, The Three Wartons. A Choice of their Verse	143	Poe en France.	493
Patzner, O.: L. P. Shanks, Flaubert's Youth.	269	Poetry of Crashaw.	275
Patch, H. R., The Goddess Fortuna.	563	Poetry, Romantic Theory of —	258
Paulding, James Kirke.	495	Pons, E., Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne.	406
<i>Peasant and his Landlord, The</i>	523	—, Swift, Les années de jeunesse et le Conte du Tonneau.	211
Peck, W. E.: R. H. Hill, The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library.	208	Pope's <i>Essay on Man</i>	429
—, Shelley, His Life and Work.	394, 498	— <i>Essay on Man</i> , Epistle II, Lines 31-34.	326
Pennington, W., An Irish Parallel to the Broken Sword of the Grail Castle.	534	— <i>To the Author of a Poem Intituled "Successio"</i>	321
Penrith, Dialect of	412	Porterfield, A. W.. F. E. Pierce and C. F. Schreiber, Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance; K. Breul, The Romantic Movement in German Literature.	486
Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith</i>	405	— N. Göke, Beiträge zur Untersuchung der literarischen und stofflichen Quellen von Immermann's <i>Münchhausen</i>	125
Perry, A. J., <i>Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum</i> by John Trevisa.	475	Portuguese, Irregular Imperfects in —.	468
Perry, H. T.: E. B. Reed, Songs from the British Drama.	207	Postma, J., Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists.	353
Personnel of Shakespeare's Company.	199	Pound, Louise: G. Grieg, Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs.	280
Petrarca, Francesco.	163	Pour et contre le romantisme.	346
Peyre, H.: P. Chapman, L. Cons, L. Levengood, W. Vree-land, An Anthology of Seventeenth-Century French Literature.	71	Pour le centenaire du romantisme, un examen de conscience.	214
Phonology and Morphology of OF.	190	Powell, A. E. (Mrs. E. R. Dodds), The Romantic Theory of Poetry.	258
Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse.	118	Pratique du Théâtre, La.	130
<i>Physiologisch, Das Wort — bei Goethe</i>	464	Praz, M., Secentismo e Marinismo in Inghilterra: John Donne, Richard Crashaw.	275
Pierce, F. E.: H. Stephenson, The Ettrick Shepherd: A Biography; Edith C. Batho, The Ettrick Shepherd.	263	Preachers and Preaching.	545
Pierce, F. E. and C. F. Schreiber, Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance.	486	Predicate Complement in O.F.	11
Pioneers, Two American —.	204	Pre-Restoration Stage.	118
Plattard, Jean, Etat présent des études rabelaisiennes.	356	<i>Prioress's Tale</i>	104
Playhouse, Elizabethan —.	118	Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time.	478
Plays and Masques.	492	Prose Fiction Before 1800.	416
Playwrights, Modern English.	402	Prose Works of Donne.	275
Plomer, H. R., and T. P. Cross, The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett.	183	Psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen.	67
		'Queen of Corinth,' <i>The</i>	112
		<i>Quinze Joyes de Mariage</i>	114

PAGE	PAGE
Rambles with Anatole France.. 194	Robertson, S., Old English Verse in Chaucer. 234
Raymond, W. O., Browning's First Mention of the Documentary Sources of the <i>Ring and the Book</i> 445	Robinson, H. C., Correspondence of 538
—, New Light on the Genesis of <i>The Ring and the Book</i> .. 357	Robles, J.: C. C. Marden and F. C. Tarr, A First Spanish Grammar 274
Raysor, T. M.: Catherine M. Maclean, Dorothy and William Wordsworth; H. W. Garrod, Wordsworth . . . 265	<i>Rodrick Random Play</i> , A . . . 111
—, Coleridge Marginalia.. 182	<i>Roman de l'estoire dou Graal, Le</i> 267
—, Two Unpublished Letters by Coleridge in Contemporary Newspapers 375	Romance, German 486
Realm of Literature..... 281	Romance of Words 478
Reaney, P. H., A Grammar of the Dialect of Penrith..... 412	Romans, Kelts and Saxons.... 481
Re-arrangement of <i>Christ and Satan</i> 108	Romantic Movement in German Literature 486
Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800. 416	Romantic Period, English.... 262
Reed, E. B., Songs from the British Drama. 207	Romantic Theory of Poetry . . 258
—, "Winter Wakeneth Al My Care" 81	Romantisme, pour et contre le Root, R. K.: W. W. Greg, The Calculus of Variants, an Essay on Textual Criticism.... 283
Reflexive verbs in O.F..... 11	<i>Rouge et le Noir Le</i> 179
Reinhard, John R., <i>Amadas et Ydoine</i> 268	Roulston, R. B., Notes on the Elegiac Distich in German.. 247
Relations of Ludwig Tieck and K. G. Carus 73	Rousseau's <i>la Nouvelle Héloïse</i> 560
Renaissance of the Twelfth Century 336	Rovillain, E., L. S. Mercier et l' <i>Elegy</i> de Gray..... 442
Rey, A.: C. Sanchez-Albornoz, <i>Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años</i> 273	Royster, J. F., E. K.'s <i>Elf</i> < <i>Guelph</i> , <i>Goblin</i> < <i>Ghibelline</i> .. 249
Reynolds, G. F.: H. N. Hillebrand, <i>The Child Actors</i> ; T. W. Baldwin, <i>The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company</i> 199	<i>Rubayat des Omar Khayyam</i> . 197
Rice, W. G., <i>The Grand Signiors Serraglio</i> : Written by Master Robert Withers..... 450	Rudwin, M.: Aristide Marie, <i>Bibliographie des œuvres de Gérard de Nerval</i> 411
Richardson, C. F., English Preachers and Preaching... 545	Rudwin, M.: Ernest Seillière, <i>Pour le centenaire du romantisme, un examen de conscience</i> 214
—, Lula M., OF. <i>crestange</i> (-nie?) <i>bodel</i> and <i>bodel sacelier</i> 529	Rudwin, M.: H. Girard et H. Moncel, <i>Pour et contre le romantisme</i> 346
Rickaby, Franz, <i>Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy</i> . . 51	<i>Rules of Civility</i> , 17
Rinaker, Clarissa: Eric Partridge, <i>The Three Wartons A Choice of their Verse</i> 143	Russell, F. T., <i>One Word More on Browning</i> 550
<i>Ring and the Book</i> , 445	—: W. C. DeVane, <i>Browning's Parleyings</i> 552
Road to Xanadu, The. 426	Rutter, G. M., <i>An Holy Jewes Shepe</i> 536
Robertson, S., Chaucer and Wordsworth 104	Ruud, M. B.: Anne Treneer, <i>The Sea in English Literature</i> ... 568
	—: Archibald Strong, <i>Beowulf</i> . Translated into Modern English Rhyming 54
	—: Franz Rickaby, <i>Ballads and Songs of the Shanty-Boy</i> 51
	—: Lillias E. Armstrong and Ida C. Ward, <i>A Handbook of English Intonation</i> 567

	PAGE		PAGE
Sánchez-Alboroz, C., Estampas de la vida en León hace mil años	273	Shanks, L. P., <i>A Note on Baudelaire</i>	181
Saracen Oath in the <i>Chansons de Geste</i>	84	—, Flanbeit's Youth	269
Satire, English	187	Shelley Correspondence	208
Savage, H. L., Note on <i>Parlement of the Three Ages</i> , 38	177	—, His Life and Work	394, 498
Scots, Romans, Kelts and —	481	Sheridan to Robertson, A Study of the Nineteenth Century London Stage	121
Scandinavian Philology	196	Siege of Famagusta	296
<i>Scènes de la vie bureaucratique</i>	236	Sigmundr and Sigurd	307
Schadler, A., <i>Boylesve Redivivus</i>	41	Simpson, Evelyn M., A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne	275
— T. R. Palfrey, <i>L'Europe littéraire</i> (1833-1834)	409	Sisam, K., Chaucer <i>The Nun's Priest's Tale</i>	206
Schneider, F., <i>Hemrich Heines Briefwechsel</i> by Friedrich Huth	525	Sixteenth-Century French Writers	157
Schreiber, C. F., F. E. Pierce and, Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance	486	Skelton, John	518
Schuchard, G. C. L., Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock	202	Skelton's <i>Garlande of Laurell</i>	314
Schulthess, Briefe von C. F. Meyer	144	Small, Miriam, R., The Source of a Note in Johnson's Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34
Schwartz, W. L., A Study of Amy Lowell's Far Eastern Verse	145	Smollett, Tobias	111
Science du Mot, La	186	Smollett's Letters	138
Scott, Walter—'s Novels on the Stage	399	Smith, H. J., Oliver Goldsmith's <i>The Citizen of the World</i>	403
Scott, Walter, <i>The Lay of The Last Minstrel</i>	38	Smith, Seba, and Elizabeth Oakes Smith	204
Sea in English Literature, The	568	Smith, W. C. W., Beaumont, The History of Harlequin; C. Mic, La Commedia dell'arte	489
Secentismo e Mannerismo in Inghilterra	275	Snyder, Alice D.: J. L. Lowes, The Road to Xanadu	426
Secord, A. W. E. S. Noyes, The Letters of Tobias Smollett, M. D.	138	Snyder, E. D., Poe and Amy Lowell	152
Sehit, E. H. M. J. Van Der Meer, Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache	352	Snyder, F. B., A Note on Burns's Language	511
Seillière, Ernest. Pour le centenaire du romantisme, un examen de conscience	214	Social Philosophy of William Morris	548
<i>Selecta Epigrammatica Graeca</i>	223	Some Recent Linguistic Studies	499
Selmon, a Mediaeval —	229	Songs, Ballads and	51
Seventeenth Century French Literature	71	Songs from the British Drama	207
Shakespeare	106	Sonnets of Argensola	163
— Improved	399	Source, French, of <i>The Rules of Civility</i>	17
—, <i>Macbeth</i>	34	— of a Note in Johnson's Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34
—, Studies	135	Source of Johnson's Edition of <i>Macbeth</i>	34
—, Ten Plays of	566	Source of Lope's <i>El Castigo del discreto</i>	310
Shakespearean Topics	278	Source of Voltaire's <i>Méropé</i>	561
Shakespeare's Company	199	Sources of Immermann's <i>Munchhausen</i>	125
— Paraphrase of his <i>Thought-executing Fires</i>	316	Sources of Percy's <i>Memoir of Goldsmith</i>	405
		Sources of the <i>Ring and the Book</i>	445

INDEX

585

PAGE	PAGE
Sources, Spanish, of Sixteenth-Century French Writers	157
Sources of Iwo Sonnets of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola	163
<i>Southern Passion, The</i>	63
Spenser's <i>Faerie Queene</i>	80
Spanish Grammar	274
Spanish Sources of certain Sixteenth-Century French Writers	157
Spencer, Hazelton, Shakespeare Improved	399
Spenser's Death	322
Spenser's <i>Shepherd's Calendar</i>	249
Spiller, R. E., The American in England	556
Stage, Elizabethan	118
Stage, New York	123
Stage, Nineteenth-Century London	121
Steadman, J. M., Jr.: A Kihlbom, A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I.	338
Stearns, Helen, John Skelton and Christopher Garnesche	518
—, The Date of the <i>Garlande of Laurell</i>	314
Steele, M.S., Plays and Masques	492
Steeves, Harrison R., Literary Aims and Art	568
Stendhal's <i>Le Rouge et le Noir</i>	179
Stephenson, H., The Ettrick Shepherd: A Biography	263
Stevens, D. H., Milton Papers	555
Stewart, H. L., Anatole France, the Parisian	344
Stokoe, F. W., German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1818	262
Stoll, E. E., Shakespeare Studies	135
Strong, Archibald, <i>Beowulf</i> . Translated into Modern English Rhyming Verse	54
Studies, Shakespeare	135
Study of Amy Lowell's Far Eastern Verse	145
Study of the Prose Works of John Donne	275
Study of the Sources of the Tales and Romances written by Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853	143
<i>Sturm und Drang</i>	171
Sturtevant, A. M., A Note on the Gothic Particle <i>pau</i>	242
<i>Successio</i> of Settle	321
Surnames	478
Swift, Jonathan	96
Swift's <i>Tale of a Tub</i>	211
Tannenbaum, S. A., <i>The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore</i>	327
Tarr, F. C., C. C. Marden and, A First Spanish Grammar	274
Tatlock, J. S. P., and A. G. Kennedy, A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer	332
Taylor, A. C. A. Williams, Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite	271
Taylor, G. C.: E. E. Stoll, Shakespeare Studies	135
Taylor, Pauline, Fredegundis and Audovera	94
Teerink, H., The History of John Bull	182
<i>Temps est un songe, Le</i>	531
Ten Plays of Shakespeare	566
Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists	353
Terrill, T. E., A Note on John Donne's Early Reading	318
Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival	285
Texts, French, of eleventh and twelfth Centuries	69
Textual Criticism	283
<i>pau</i> , Gothic Particle	242
Théâtre en France au Moyen Age, Le	484
Theatre, French	130
Thème, Le, et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie Anglo-Saxonne	406
Theory of Poetry	258
Thiel, M. A., La figure de Saül et sa représentation dans la littérature dramatique française	285
<i>Though-executing Fires</i> , Shakespeare's Paraphrase of	316
Three Irregular Portuguese Imperfects	468
Tieck, Letters to	459
Tieck, Ludwig, and K. G. Carus —, Letter of	308
Todd, O. J., Who wrote Shakespeare's Plays?	106

	PAGE		PAGE
Tolman, A. H., Falstaff and Other Shakespearean Topics.	278	Waller, R. D., <i>The Monks and the Grants</i> , by John Hookham Frere	142
Torrey, N. L., A Note on Voltaire's <i>Commentaire Historique</i>	439	Walpole, Horace	319
Translator, English, of <i>Werther</i>	36	Ward, Ida C., Lilius E. Armstrong and, A Handbook of English Intonation	567
Treener, Anne, The Sea in English Literature	568	Warren, A. C. F. Richardson, English Preachers and Preaching	545
Trevisa, John, <i>Dialogus inter Militum et Clericum</i>	475	Warren, F. M., Was Balzac's <i>Illusions Perdues</i> influenced by Stendhal?	179
Tunsbergensis, codex	72	Warton's, The Three. A Choice of their Verse	143
Turner, F. McD. C., The Element of Irony in English Literature, An Essay	355	Was Balzac's <i>Illusions Perdues</i> influenced by Stendhal?	179
Turner, R. J. F. Bense, Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third	210	Watson, E. B., Sheridan to Robertson, A Study of the Nineteenth-Century London Stage	121
Twelfth Century	336	Weber, C. J.: Mary A. Wyman, Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith	204
Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith	204	Weekley, E., Surnames; Romance of Words	478
Uhler, J. E.: J. W. Cunliffe, Modern English Playwrights.	402	Wells, H. W., The Realm of Literature	281
Uhler, K., Die Bedeutungsähnlichkeit der Altenglischen Adjektiva und Adverbia mit und ohne -lic (-lice)	203	Welsford, E., The Court Masque	492
Urfé, Honoré d', <i>L'Astrée</i>	134	Wendell, Barrett, Essays in Memory of	496
Vaganay, H., Honoré d'Urfé, <i>L'Astrée</i>	134	Wendell, B., The History of the Translation of the Martyrs	475
Valkyrie Episode in the <i>Njáls Saga</i>	471	Werther, The First English Translator of	36
Van den Bruck, Moeller, Goethe	55	—, English Translation of	467
Variants, Calculus of	283	Wesenberg, T. G., The Case of the Predicate Complement after Reflexive Verbs in Old French	11
Verbs, reflexive	11	White, H. A., Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage	399
Verse, OE — in Chaucer	234	White, H. C., The Mysticism of William Blake	538
—, English	101	Whitford, R. C.: H. Walker, English Satirist and Satirists	187
—, Far Eastern	145	Whitford, R. C., Gleanings of Churchill Bibliography	30
Versification of Klopstock	202	Who Wrote Shakespeare's Plays?	106
Villamediana, El Conde de	553	Wieland-Doppeldrucke	1
Villiers de l'Isle Adam's <i>L'Intersigne</i>	531	— Doppeldrucke	91
Voltaire's <i>Commentaire historique</i>	439	— Doppeldrucke	153
—, Marginal Comments upon Pope's <i>Essay on Man</i>	429	Willard, Rudolph: Erna Fischer, Der Lautbestand des südmitteleuropäischen Octavian,	
— <i>Mérope</i>	561		
<i>Völungasaga</i>	307		
Vooys, C. G. N. De, Middelnederlandse Legendes en Exempelen	61		
Walker, H., English Satire and Satirists	187		

PAGE	PAGE
verglichen mit seinen Entsprechungen im Lybeaus Desconus und im Launfal. 567	Wright, L. B.: Arthur Gray, A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare. Polesworth in Arden 144
Willard, Rudolph: Henry Cecil Wyld, A Short History of English 496	—, Heywood and the Popularizing of History 287
Williams, C. A., Oriental Affinities of the Legend of the Hairy Anchorite 271	—, M. S. Steel, Plays and Masques; E. Welsford, The Court Masque. 492
Williams, E. B., Three Irregular Portuguese Imperfects 468	—, Ola Elizabeth Winslow, Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642 66
Williamson, G., Sir Thomas More's View of Drama 294	—, W. J. Lawrence, The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse;—Pre-Restoration Stage Studies 118
Winnere and Wastoure 47	Wyld, Henry Cecil, A Short History of English 496
Winslow, Ola Elizabeth, Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642 66	Wyman, Mary A., Two American Pioneers—Seba Smith and Elizabeth Oakes Smith.. 204
"Winter Wakeneth Al My Care" 81	Xanadu, The Road to 426
Withers, Robert, <i>The Grand Signiors Serraglio</i> 450	Yeoman, Chaucer's.. . . . 176
Withington, R., A Note on <i>Eastward Ho</i> , I, ii. 178 28	Zachrisson, R. E., Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time.. 478
Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries 69	—, Romans, Kelts and Saxons 481
Woodbridge, B. M.: William F. Giese, Victor Hugo. The Man and the Poet 70	Zeitler, W. I., The Date of Spenser's Death 322
Words, Romance of 478	Zeydel, E. H., Nachtrage zu Holteis <i>Briefe an Tieck</i> 459
Wordsworth, Chaucer and 104	—, <i>Sturm und Drang</i> once more 171
—, Leopardi and 538	—, The Relations of Ludwig Tieck and K. G. Carus 73
—, Dorothy and William 265	Zigzags autour de nos parlers.. 342
Wort <i>Physiologisch</i> bei Goethe, Das 464	Zucker, A. E.: Halvdan Koht, Henrik Ibsen, Eit Diktarliv . 569
Wray, Edith, English Adaptations of French Drama between 1780 and 1815 87	
Wright, L. B., A Note on Dramatic Piracy 256	

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

- Arnold, Matthew.—Prose and Poetry, ed. A. L. Bouton, The Modern Student's Library. New York: Scribner's, 1927. Pp. xxxvi + 513. \$1.00.
- Batho, Edith C.—The Ettrick Shepherd. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Pp. 234.
- Beatty, Arthur.—William Wordsworth. 2nd edition (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 24). Madison, Wis.: 1927. Pp. 310. \$2.00.
- Bridges, Robert.—The Influence of the Audience on Shakespeare's Drama (Collected Essays, I). New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. Pp. x + 29. \$1.00.
- S. P. E. Tract No. XXVIII. English Handwriting. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. 65. \$3.50.
- Campbell, Killis (ed.).—Poe's Short Stories. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1927. Pp. xxxvi + 460.
- Carman, Bliss (ed.).—Oxford Book of American Verse. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. xxix + 680. \$3.75.
- Chadwick, N. Kershaw.—An Early Irish Reader. Cambridge: The University Press, 1927. Pp. vi + 75.
- Chambers, E. K.—Arthur of Britain. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1927. Pp. 299. 10 s. 6 d.
- Chase, Mary Ellen.—Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1927. Pp. 210. \$2.50.
- Crane, R. S. (ed.).—New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. xli + 147. \$3.00.
- Crane, R. S. and Kaye, F. B.—A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1927. Pp. 205.
- De Reul, Paul.—The Art and Thought of Robert Browning. The Rice Institute Pamphlet, vol. XIII, no. 4. Houston, Texas: The Rice Institute, 1926. Pp. 304.
- Fagin, N. Bryllion.—The Phenomenon of Sherwood Anderson. Baltimore: The Ross-Bryn Company, 1927. Pp. 156. \$2.00.
- Fischer, Erna.—Der Laubbestand des südmitteleuropäischen Octavian (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 63). Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1927. Pp. 216. M. 14.
- Judson, A. C. (ed.).—Seventeenth-Century Lyrics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. xix + 413. \$2.50.
- Godley, A. D.—Fifty Poems. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. 125. \$1.75. [Admirable light verse on subjects of academic interest.]
- Hadida, Sophie C.—Pitfalls in English. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927. Pp. 381.
- Hammond, Eleanor P.—English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1927. Pp. 591. \$6.50.
- Hubbell, Jay B. and Beaty, John O.—An Introduction to Drama. New York: Macmillan, 1927. Pp. 838.
- Johnson, Samuel.—The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. xxi + 221. \$3.00. [Beautifully printed, with textual notes and a brief introduction dealing with the history of the composition of this work and with Johnson's revisions in general.]
- Kihlborn, Asta.—A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English. London: David Nutt, 1927. Pp. 202.
- Maclean, C. M.—Dorothy and William Wordsworth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927. Pp. 129.
- Murdock, K. B. (ed.).—Handkerchiefs from Paul, being Pious and Consolatory Verses of Puritan Massachusetts including Unpublished Poems by Benjamin Tompson, John Wilson and Anna Hayden. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. lxxiii + 134.
- Murray, Gilbert.—The Classical Tradition in Poetry. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. vi + 274. \$3.00.
- Oxford Reading Courses: *The English Novel*, by A. C. Valentine; *Biography*, by A. C. Valentine; *The Essay*, by M. E. Speare. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. \$1.00 each. [Small volumes containing a selected reading-list, a critical essay on books listed, and questions; intended for the better type of woman's clubs or for the solitary reader who needs guidance, and competently prepared.]
- Partridge, Eric.—The Three Warton's, a Choice of their Verse. London: The Scholartis Press, 1927. Pp. 192.
- Peck, W. E.—Shelley, His Life and Work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927. Vol. I, pp. x + 532; vol. II, pp. 490.

Plomer, Henry R., and Cross, Tom Peete. —The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett. (Modern Philology Monographs) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. 89. \$2.00

Railo, Eino.—The Haunted Castle. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1927. Pp. vii + 388 \$10 00

Reference Library—English Language and Literature (The English Association Pamphlet No. 66). New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp. 31. \$85.

Spencer, Hazelton.—Shakespeare Improved. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp vi + 406 \$5.00

Stephenson, H. T.—The Ettrick Shepherd. A Biography (University of Indiana Studies, No 54). Bloomington, Ind., 1927. Pp. 109. \$50

Stevens, David H.—Milton Papers (Modern Philology Monographs). University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. 46.

Stokoe, F. W.—German Influence in the English Romantic Period. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926. Pp. x + 202.

Treble, H. A. and Vallins, G. H.—The Gateway to English, Part IV. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1927. Pp vi + 224. \$1.25.

Trevisa, John.—Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, Richard Fitz Ralph's Sermon: 'Defensio Curatorum,' and Methodius: 'The Bygnyng of the World and the Ende of Worlides.' E. E. T. S., Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. clvi + 116.

Turner, F. McD. C.—The Element of Irony in English Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926. Pp. 109.

White, H. A.—Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. 259.

Wells, H. W.—The Realm of Literature. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927 Pp. 182. \$2.00.

GERMAN

Arens, Eduard.—Werner von Haxthausen und sein Verwandtenkreis als Romantiker. Mit unveröff. Porträts. Aichach: L. Schütte, 1927. 94 pp. M. 4.

Behrend, Fritz.—Geschichte der deutschen Philologie in Bildern. Eine Ergänzung zu dem Deutschen Literatur-Atlas von Könecke-Behrend. Marburg: Elwert, 1927. xii pp., 78 leaves. 4°. Bound, M. 7.50.

Bithell, J.—German-English and English-German Commercial Dictionary. Second Edition. New York: Pitman & Sons, 1927. 984 pp. \$4.50.

Grohmann, Werner.—Die pronominalen Anredeformen im Drama des 18 Jh. Diss. Leipzig: 1926. 122 pp.

Gump, Margarete.—Stifters Kunstan-schauung. Diss. München. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1927. 94 pp. M. 3.

Huss, Richard.—Studien zum luxemburgischen Sprachatlas [Beiträge zur luxemburgischen Sprach- u. Volkskunde, Nr. 2]. Luxemburg: Linden & Hansen, 1927. 68 pp. M. 1.50.

Keim, H. W.—Beiträge zur Disseldorfer Literaturgeschichte 1. Immermanns Kunstkritische Schriften. 2. Friedrich von Uechtritz. [Pempelfort. Bd 25]. Dusseldorf: L. Schwann, 1927. 63 pp. M. 3.

Kerner, Justinus.—Briefwechsel zwischen —und Ottilie Wildermuth 1853-1862. Hrag. von Adelheid Wildermuth. Heilbronn: E. Salzer, 1927. 202 pp. M. 4.

Lüers, Grete.—Die Sprache der deutschen Mystik des Mittelalters im Werke der Mechtild von Magdeburg. München: E. Reinhardt, 1926. xv, 319 pp. M. 13.

Murner, Thomas.—Deutsche Schriften mit den Holzschnitten der Erstdrucke. Hrag. v. Franz Schulz. Bd. 1, Tl. 2: Baden-fahrt. Hrag. von Victor Michels [Krit. Gesamtausgaben elsass. Schriftsteller des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit]. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927. xlv, 269 pp. M. 20.

Peters, W. E.—Bericht über eine experimentalphonetische vergleichende Untersuchung der estnischen Sprechmelodie. Hamburg: Deutscher Auslandsverlag W. Bangert, 1927. 16 pp. M. 1.

Schein, Willy.—Stilistische Untersuchungen zu den Werken Pamphilus Gengenbach. Diss., Teildruck. Jena: 1927. 57 pp.

Schiller, Friedrich.—Die Jungfrau von Orleans. Eine romantische Tragödie. Ed. by R. S. Heffner. New York: Holt [1927]. xxxiv, 326 pp.

Schmidt, Willibald.—Altdeutsches Namentgut in Tölzer Familiennamen. [Jahresber. d. Städt. Realschule Bad Tölz, 1926-27]. Bad Tölz: J. Dewitz, 1927. 16 pp. M. 1.

Schulte-Kemminghausen, K.—Die "Synonyma" Jakob Schöpfers. Habil.-Schrift. Münster: 1927. 177 pp.

Weber, Carl A.—Der Dichter d. Heliand im Verhältnis zu seinen Quellen. Diss. Göttingen: 1927. 70 pp.

Weil, Felix.—Victor Hugo et Richard Wagner. Leurs conceptions dramatiques. Diss. Bern: 1926. 139 pp.

Weimars klassische Kulturstätten. Ein Helfer zu besinnlichem Schauen. Hrag. v. Alb. Mollberg. Weimar: Panse [1927]. viii, 116 pp. M. 2.

FRENCH

Albalat, A.—*Flaubert et ses amis. Paris: Plon, 1927. 296 pp. Fr. 12.*

Béziat and Dey.—*Fr. grammar. Richmond: Johnson, 1927. xv + 537 pp. \$1.64.*

Billy, A.—*La litt. fr. contemporaine. Paris: Colin, 1927. 212 pp. Fr. 9.*

Blondheim, D. S.—*Poèmes judéo-. Paris: Champion, 1927. 87 pp. Fr. 20.*

Boisrobert.—*Episties en vers, éd. crit. M. Cauchie. Paris: Hachette, 1927. 400 pp. Fr. 300. (Textes fr. mod.)*

Crétin, R.—*Les images dans l'œuvre de Corneille. Paris: Champion, 1927. 390 pp. Fr. 20.*

Doillet, L.—*Papassier, ed Kerr and Sonet. New York: Ginn, 1927. xi + 196 pp. 80 cts.*

Faucher, R.—*Le tombeau de Verhaeren. Paris: Delpeuch, 1927. 16 pp. Fr. 4.*

Flaubert, Gustavo.—*Pensieri. Milano: G. Morreale, 1926. 244 pp. L. 10.*

Furly, J. S.—*The ancient usages of the city of Winchester. New York: Oxford Press, 1927. 68 pp. \$2.50.*

Gardiner, L. J.—*Outlines of Fr. lit. London: Univ. Tutorial Press, 1927. 474 pp. 7 sh. 6 d.*

Gassies des Brulies.—*Anthologie du théâtre du moyen-âge. Paris: Delagrave, 1927. 476 pp. Fr. 12.*

Gautier, T.—*Emaux et Camées, éd. crit. J. Madeline. Paris: Hachette, 1927. xvi + 160 pp. Fr. 15. (Textes fr. mod.)*

Genévrier, P.—*Précis de phonétique comparée fr. et angl. Cambridge, Eng.: Heffer, and Paris: Didier, 1927. 379 pp. 5 sh.*

Giafferi, P.-L. de.—*Hist. du costume masculin fr. de 420 à 1870. Paris: Nilsson, 1927. 80 fr.*

Grosjean, W. H.—*L'Europe en zigzag. New York: Nelson, 1927. xii + 232 pp. \$1.60.*

Johansson, J. V.—*Etudes sur Diderot. Paris: Champion, 1927. 205 pp. Fr. 30.*

Kastner, L. E.—*Fr. poets of the twentieth cent. Anthology. New York: Dutton, 1927. xxxiii + 281 pp. \$2.25.*

Labiche et Martin.—*Perrichon, ed. C. F. Zeek. Richmond: Johnson, 1927. xiii + 160 pp. \$1.08.*

Levi, M.—*Reading, writing, and speaking Fr. New York: Holt, 1927. xv + 344 pp.*

Lichtenberger, A.—*Contes de Minnie, ed. J. G. Anderson. New York: Oxford Press, 1927. 96 pp. 45 cts.*

Liuzzi, F.—*Arturo Rimbaud. Roma: A. F. Formigini, 1926. 72 pp. L. 5. (Profili, no. 85.)*

Mérimee.—*Colomba, ed. O. T. Robert. New York: Heath, 1927. xviii + 350 pp. 92 cts.*

Molière.—*L'Avare, ed. F. Anderson. Boston: Ginn, 1927. xxii + 162 pp.*

—*Le Misanthrope, ed. T. E. Oliver. New York: Holt, 1927. lviii + 273 pp.*

Pradez, E.—*Dict. des gallicismes. Paris: Payot, 1927. 396 pp. Fr. 15.*

Pumpelly, L.—*French reader. New York: Knopf, 1927. xiii + 136 pp. \$1.20.*

Recueil de chansons pieuses du XIII^e s., pub. p. T. Järnström et A. Långfors. II. Helsingfors: Société de litt. finnoise, 1927. 213 pp.

Seillière, E.—*Les Goncourt moralistes. Paris: Nouv. rev. crit., 1927. Fr. 12.*

Simpson, E. L.—*Five easy Fr. plays. New York: Ginn, 1926. 172 pp. 80 cts.*

Taverny, A.—*La Versification du fr. moderne. London: Heffer, 1927. 2 sh.*

Vast et Jalliffier.—*Hist. de Fr., ed. J. Greenberg. New York: Merrill, 1926. 161 pp. 75 cts.*

Weerenbeck, B.-H.-J.—*Participe présent et gérondif. Paris: Champion, 1927. 330 pp. Fr. 60.*

ITALIAN

Biondi, E.—*Presunti ritratti di Dante. Fossombrone: Tip. F. Monacelli, 1927. 10 pp.*

Cajumi, A.—*I cancelli d'oro: profili e parabole. Milano: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1926. 195 pp. L. 9. (Cultura contemporanea: biblioteca di letteratura, storia e filosofia, no. 10.)*

Cellini, Benvenuto.—*La Vita, scritta per lui medesimo; introduzione e note di E. Carrara. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1927. 2 vols., xxxiii + 218, 275 pp. L. 8 each volume. (Classici italiani con note, serie 2a, ni. 24 e 25.)*

Dall'Ongaro, F.—*Gesta ed eroi del Risorgimento italiano a cura di Marissa. Venezia: "La Nuova Italia," 1927. vii + 107 pp. L. 12.*

De' Medici, Lorenzo.—*Canzoni scandalose; introduzione di M. Buggelli. Milano: "L'Aristocratica," 1927. 146 pp. L. 14. (Collana di testi e documenti per servire alla storia dei costumi: I Classici dell'amore, no. 38.)*

Fucini, Renato (Neri Tanfucio).—*Le Veglie di Neri, con prefazione di F. Paolieri. Firenze: A. Quattrini, 1926. iv + 183 pp. L. 3. (Il romanzo universale, no. 11.)*

Gambarin, G.—*L'amore nella vita e nell'arte di Giovanni Pascoli. Conferenza. Tunisi: Tip. Finzi, 1927. 36 pp.*

Guicciardini, Francesco.—Ricordi politici e civili, con introduzione, richiami e indice analitico, a cura di V. Osimo. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1926. 134 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, n. 38-39.)

La Sorsa, S.—Fiabe e novelle del popolo pugliese; con prefazione di A. Mari. Vol. I. *Bari-Roma*: F. Casini e figlio, 1927. vii + 316 pp. L. 12.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il Principe. I discorsi; con introduzione e note di A. Oxilia. *San Casciano-Pesa*: Soc. edit. Toscana, 1927. xxxix + 383 pp. L. 5. (Classici italiani e stranieri, no. 17.)

Manzoni, Alessandro.—I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII, scoperta e rifatta. Prefazione di A. Faggi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1926. xxiii + 472 pp. L. 9.50. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Margonari, V.—Il comandante: Gabriele D'Annunzio. Episodi fiutani. *Milano*: L. di G. Pirola, 1926. 309 pp. L. 60.

Olschki, L.—Giordano Bruno *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 107 pp. L. 8.50. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 145.)

Palmieri, E.—Giosuè Carducci. Studio intorno alla critica e alla lirica carducciana, con appendice e bibliografia. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1926. xv + 282 pp. L. 12.

Petraccone, E.—La commedia dell'arte: storia, tecnica, scenari, a cura di —. *Napoli*: R. Ricciardi, 1927. viii + 458 pp. L. 40.

Petrarca, Francesco.—La vita solitaria. Versione di L. Ascoli. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1927. xxiii + 159 pp. L. 10.50.

Ramírez, O.—El teatro de Pirandello. *Buenos Aires*: Agencia General de Librería y Publicaciones, 1927. 144 pp. 2 pesos.

Romagnoli, E.—Grotteschi Serie prima. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. 186 pp. L. 15.

Sammartano, N.—Emilio De Marchi. *Palermo-Roma*: R. Sandron, 1926. 172 pp. L. 7. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 112.)

Sposato, Beatrice.—L'evoluzione poetica di Giosuè Carducci. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1927. 173 pp. L. 8.

Yela Utrilla, J. F.—Antología del primer curso de lengua italiana. *Lérida*: Imp. Mariana, 1927. 160 pp. 5 ptas. (Biblioteca didáctica Urriza, III.)

SPANISH

Angeles, J. de los.—Diálogos de la conquista del reino de Dios. Pról. de A. Mir. *Madrid*: Gregorio del Amo, 1926. 408 pp.

Artigas, M.—Aspectos del hispanismo en la Alemania actual. *Madrid*: Blass, 1927, 15 pp. 1 pta. (Conferencias dadas en el Centro de Intercambio Intelectual Germano-Español.)

Cejador, J.—Cantarazos. Artículos inéditos. *Madrid*: Radio, 1927. 120, 120 y 128 pp. 4.50 ptas. los tres tomos.

Darío, Rubén.—Canto épico a las glorias de Chile y otros cantos. *Madrid*: Ed. por la Biblioteca "Rubén Darío," [1927]. 197 pp. 10 ptas. (Obras completas, vol. XIV.)

Eijo Garay, L.—De la oratoria sagrada en España. Discurso de recepción en la R. A. E. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1927. 58 pp. S. p.

García Caraffa, A. y A.—Diccionario heráldico y genealógico de apellidos españoles y americanos. Tomo XXV. *Madrid*: Imp. de A. Marzo, 1927 pp + xv láminas. 65 ptas.

Giusti, R. F.—Crítica y polémica. Tercera serie. *Buenos Aires*: Agencia Gral. de Librería y Publicaciones, 1927. 184 pp. 2 50 pesos.

Jarnés, B.—Ejercicios *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1927. 92 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Cuadernos Literarios, núm. 16.)

Larra, M. de.—Artículos políticos y sociales *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1127. 5, 7 6 9 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, 77.)

Martínez de la Riva, R.—La España de hoy *Madrid*: Imp. G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1926. 286 pp. 5 ptas.

Miró, G.—El libro de Sigüenza. *Madrid*: Biblioteca Nueva, 1927. 270 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras completas, VI.)

Navarro Tomás, T.—Compendio de Ortología Española, para la enseñanza de la pronunciación normal en relación con las diferencias dialectales. Pról. de Menéndez Pidal. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. 96 pp. 1.25 ptas.

Sáinz Rodríguez, P.—Introducción a la historia de la literatura mística en España. Premio Nacional de Literatura. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1927. 310 pp. 10 ptas.

San Juan de Piedras Albas, Marqués de.—Fiestas de toros. Bosquejo histórico. *Madrid*: A. Marzo, 1927. xvi + 526 pp. 15 ptas.

Susto, J. A.—Panamá en el Archivo General de Indias. *Panamá*: Imp. Nacional, 1927. 48 pp.

Vergara y Martín, G. M.—Diccionario de voces y términos geográficos. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. 226 pp. 7 ptas.

Villa-Urrutia, Marqués de.—Los embajadores de España en París de 1883 a 1889. Don Juan Valera, diplomático y hombre de mundo. La embajada del Conde de Gondomar. El estilo diplomático. Un discurso.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GERMAN

Birk, Bernhard.—Ein Jahrhundert schwäbischer politischer und patriotischer Dichtung. Diss. *München*: 1927. viii, 132 pp.

Bites-Palevitch, Milda.—Essai sur les tendances critiques et scientifiques de l'esthétique allemande contemporaine. *Paris*: Alcan, 1927. xv, 335 pp. Fr. 15.

Clarke, Margaret, A.—Henri Heine et la Monarchie de Juillet. [Bibliothèque de littérature comparée. 23]. *Paris*: Éditions Rieder, 1927. 276 pp. Fr. 25.

Diamond, Wilham, and Reinsch, Frank H.—Nachlese. Easy short stories from contemporary German literature. With Introduction, Notes, Exercises, and Vocabulary. *New York*: Holt [1927]. 313 pp.

Eberhard, Priester.—Die Gandersheimer Reimchronik. Hrg. von Ludw. Wolff. [Altdeu. Textbibliothek. Nr. 25]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1927. xlii, 79 pp. M. 3.

Eilers, Konrad.—Charakterologie von Hermann Löns. Diss. *Rostock*: 1927. 199 pp.

Feist, Sigmund.—Germanen und Kelten in der antiken Überlieferung. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1927. iv, 75 pp. M. 4.

Fell, Alo.—Gutzkows Ritter vom Geiste. Psychogenetische Untersuchung zur Frage des Übergangs von Romantik zu Realismus. [Veröffentl. d. Deutschen Instituts an d. Techn. Hochschule Aachen, H. 3]. *Aachen*: Aachener Verlags- u. Druckerei-Gesellsch. 1927. 66 pp. M. 2.

Fiedler, H. G.—Das Oxforder Buch Deutscher Dichtung vom 12. ten bis zum 20. ten Jahrhundert. Mit einem Geleitwort von Gerhart Hauptmann. [Revised and enlarged edition]. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1927. xii, 647 pp. \$3.25.

Fiesel, Eva.—Die Sprachphilosophie der deutschen Romantik. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1927. iv, 259 pp. M. 12.

Goethe.—Reise-Zerstreuungs- und Trost-Büchlein vom September 1806 bis dahin 1807, Ihro der Prinzessin Caroline von Weimar Durchl. unterthänigst gewidmet. [Faks.-Neudr. Begleitwort von Hans Wahl.] *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1927]. 77 leaves, 18 pp., 10.5 × 19 cm. M. 60.

— Briefe und Tagebücher. (Taschenausgabe in 2 Bdn. auf Dünndruckpapier. Hrg. H. Gräf.). *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1927]. 886, 861 pp. Cloth, M. 20.

Grimm, Jakob.—Briefwechsel zwischen — und Karl Goedeke, hrg. v. Johannes Bolte. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1927. 112 pp. M. 4.

Haecker, Valentin.—Goethes morphologische Arbeiten und die neuere Forschung. Mit 28 Abb. im Text. *Jena*: Fischer, 1927. vi, 98 pp. M. 5.

Hagboldt, Peter.—Inductive Readings in German. Book II: An Introduction to the Spirit of German Life and Literature. *Chicago*: Univ. of Chicago Press [1927]. xv, 172 pp. \$1.25.

Hägni, Rudolf.—Alfred Huggenberger. Persönlichkeit und Werk. *Leipzig*: Staackmann, 1927. 62 pp. 80 Pf.

Halbach, Kurt.—Walther von der Vogelweide und die Dichter von Minnesangs Frühling. [Tübinger germanist. Arbeiten. Bd. 3]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1927. vi, 147 pp. M. 9.

Hoffmann, Paul.—Heinrich von Kleist und Wilhelm Reuter. *Berlin*: S. M. Fraenkel, 1927. 63 pp. M. 12.

Hopf, Walther.—Jeremias Gotthelf im Kreise seiner Amtsbrüder und als Pfarrer. *Bern*: Francke, 1927. 168 pp. M. 3.50.

Hunziker, Erwin.—Carducci und Deutschland. *Aarau*: H. R. Sauerländer & Co., 1927. xii, 189 pp. M. 4.80.

Itzerott, Elisabeth.—Bemerkungen zu Friedrich Hebbels Tagebuchaufzeichnungen im Lichte christlicher Weltanschauung. *Berlin*: B. Behr, 1927. 335 pp. M. 6.50.

Jacobi, Franz.—Kultur der Aussprache. *München*: R. Oldenbourg, 1927. iv, 219 pp. Cloth, M. 8.

Jahrbuch, Literaturwissenschaftliches, der Görres-Gesellschaft. In Verbindung mit Jos. Nadler und Leo Wiese hrg. von Günther Müller. Bd. 2. *Freiburg*: Herder, 1927. v, 150 pp. 4°. M. 6.

Karl und Elegast.—Der mitteldeutsche — nach der Zeitzer Hs. hrg. v. Jos. Quint. [Rheinische Beiträge zur germ. Phil. u. Volkskunde. 14]. *Bonn*: Fritz Klopp, 1927. M. 7.

Keller, Gottfried.—Briefe. Ausgewählt, eingeleitet und erläutert von Max Nussberger. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut [1927]. 24, 541 pp. Cloth, M. 5.30.

— Aus Gottfried Kellers glücklicher Zeit. Der Dichter im Briefwechsel mit Marie und Adolf Exner. *Wien*: F. G. Spieldel [1927]. 182 pp. Cloth, M. 11.00.

Kleinberg, Alfred.—Die deutsche Dichtung in ihren sozialen, zeit- und geistesgeschichtlichen Bedingungen. Eine Skizze. *Berlin*: J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. [1927]. xv, 443 pp. M. 12.

Koethke, Ernst.—Clemens Brentanos religiöser Werdegang. *Hamburg*: Ed. Lanzberger [1927]. 86 pp. M. 2.50.

Landgrebe, W.—Hebbels Nibelungen auf der Bühne. [Forschungen zur Literatur-Theater- und Zeitungswissenschaft, Bd. 1]. *Oldenburg*: Schulze, 1927, 104 pp.

Lerche, Otto.—Der Schwager [Goethes, Christian Aug. Vulpius]. Eine Säkularerinnerung zum 25. Juni, 1927. *Leipzig*: Selbstverlag, 1927. 20 pp. M. 2.

Lessiak, Primus.—Die Einheit Kärntens im Lichte der Namenkunde und Sprache. 2. Aufl. *Klagenfurt*: Kärntner Heimatbund, 1927. 16 pp. Sch. 1.

Maync, Harry.—Deutsche Dichter. Reden und Abhandlungen. *Frauenfeld*: Huber [1927]. ix, 304 pp. Fr. 9.

Mensing, Erwin.—Jungstdeutsche Dichter in ihren Beziehungen zu J. M. R. Lenz. Diss. München. *Dresden*: Römmler & Jonas. 68 pp.

Mohme, Erwin C.—Die freireligiösen Anschauungen im Drama und Roman der neueren deutschen Literatur (1885-1914). [New York Univ. Ottendorfer Series of Germanic Monographs No. 17]. *St. Louis, Mo.*: Eden Publishing House, 1927. 156 pp.

Moortgat, A.—Germanismen in het Nederlandsch. *Gent*: Vanderpoorten, 1927. xxxviii, 254 pp. Fr. 20.

Philips, F. C. A.—Friedrich Nicolais literarische Bestrebungen. *Haag, Holland*: W. P. van Stockum & Sohn, 1926. ix, 320 pp. M. 10.50.

Pietsch, Paul.—Ewangelij und Epistel Teutsch. Die gedruckten hochdeutschen Perikopenbücher (Plenarien) 1473 bis 1523. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Wiegen-drucke, zur Geschichte des deutschen Schrift-tums u. der deutschen Sprache, insbes. der Bibelverdeutschung und der Bibelsprache. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927. xxiv, 308 pp. M. 13.

Purdie, Edna.—The Story of Judith in German and English Literature. [Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée, Tome xxxix]. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 161 pp.

Rupprich, Hans.—Brentano, Luise Hensel und Ludwig von Gerlach. Mit 6 Bildtafeln. [Deutsche Kultur. 6]. *Wien*: Österr. Bundesverlag für Unterricht, 1927. 226 pp. M. 17.

Schlaf, Johannes.—Tantchen Mohnhaupt. Ed. with Introd., Notes, Exercises, Vocabulary by Clifford E. Gates, Ph.D. *New York*: Alfred Knopf, 1927. ix, 149 pp.

Selmer, Ernst W.—Über den Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels im Nordfriesischen. [Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo II. Hist.-filos. Kl. 1926, 2].

mente im Nibelungenlied. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der sozialen Herkunft des Verfassers. Diss. *München*: 1926. 69 pp.

Stael, Baronin v.—Ein fremder Gast. Frau von Staël in Deutschland 1803-04. Nach Briefen und Dokumenten von Alfred Götz. *Jena*: Frommann, 1928. ix, 176 pp. M. 3.50.

Strauss, Walter.—Friedrich Nicolai und die kritische Philosophie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aufklärung. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer, 1927. 96 pp. M. 4.50.

Streitberg, Wilh.—Die gotische Bibel. Tl. 2: Gotisch-griechisch-deutsches Wbch. 2. Aufl. [Germanische Bibliothek. Abt. 2, Bd. 3]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1928. xii, 180 pp. M. 3.

Stülpnagel, Ulrich.—Graf Eduard von Kayserling und sein episches Werk. Diss. *Rostock*: 1926. 133 pp.

Teske, Hans.—Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Schriftsprache in Lüneburg. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1927. xv, 176 pp. M. 9.

Vollmer, Hans.—Ein deutscher glossierter Auszug des 15. Jhs. aus den Alttestamentlichen Propheten, erstmalig hrsg. u. gewürdigt. [Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiösen Volkskunde des Mittelalters, Bd. III]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1927. LV, 100 pp., 5 plates. M. 10.

Weissel, Otto.—Der Advokat Goethe. *Wien*: Manz [1927]. viii, 72 pp. Sch. 2.

Wielands Werke. Vierzehnter Band. Prosaische Schriften I, 1773-1783. Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer. [Wielands Gesammelte Schriften, Hrsg. von der Deutschen Kommission der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Erste Abteilung, 14. Bd.]. *Berlin*: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1928. vi, 460, 210 pp.

Wrede, Adam.—Alt kölnischer Sprach-schatz. 1. Lfg. *Köln*: Fritz Klopp, 1927. 128 cols. M. 4.

Ziesemer, Walther.—Eine ostdeutsche Apostelgeschichte des 14. Jhs. (aus dem Königsberger Staatsarchiv, Hs. A 191). [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, Nr. 24]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1927. III, 106 pp. M. 3.20.

FRENCH

Adie, C. J. M.—Essentials of Fr. Syntax. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. 56 pp. 40 cts.

Arnold, I.—L'Apparicion maistre Jehan de Meun et le Somnium materia scismatis d'Honoré Bonet. Diss. *Strasbourg*: 1926. lxxvi + 135 pp.

Beck, J. B.—Les chansonniers des troubadours et des trouvères. Vol. I: rts. 1 and

- Billy, A.—La litt. fr. contemp. *Paris*: Colin, 1927. 212 pp. Fr. 9.
- Brach, P.—La destinée d'A. de Vigny. *Paris*: Plon, 1927. 284 pp. Fr. 15.
- Brun, A.—La langue fr. en Provence. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 170 pp. Fr. 16.
- Cornilleau, R.—H. de Balzac. *Paris*: Edit. Spes, 1927. 222 pp. Fr. 5.
- Delpit, L.—Representative contemp. Fr. lyrics. *New York*: Ginn, 1927. xxiv + 385 pp. \$1.20.
- Dillingham, L. B.—The creative imagination of T. Gautier. Bryn Mawr diss. *Princeton*: Psychological Review Co., 1927. x + 350 pp.
- Dumas.—Les 3 mousquetaires, ed. Sumichrast and Ball. *Boston*: Ginn, 1925. iv + 361 pp. 96 cts.
- Fischer, M. and A.—Des histoires drôles pour la jeunesse, ed. G. A. Ratti. *New York*: Knopf. 245 pp. \$1.50.
- Flottes, P.—La pensée politique et sociale d'A. de Vigny. Diss. *Strasbourg*: Fac. des lettres, 1926. xvi + 360 pp.
- L'ind. d'A. de Vigny sur Leconte de Lisle. Diss. *Strasbourg*: Fac. des lettres, 1926. 106 pp.
- Giraud, J.—L'école romantique fr. *Paris*: A. Colin, 1927. 203 pp.
- Grosjean, W. H.—French verb bk. *New York*: Nelson, 1927. vii + 176 pp.
- Howe, M. J.—G. Sand; the search for love. *New York*: Day, 1927. 366 pp. \$5.
- Jaloux, E.—De Pascal à Barrès. *Paris*: Plon, 1927. 264 pp. Fr. 12.
- Joannidès.—La Comédie fr. (1926). *Paris*: Plon, 1927. 40 pp. Fr. 20.
- Jones, H. M.—America and Fr. culture, 1750-1848. *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C. Press, 1927. 631 pp. \$5.
- Kerr, W. A. R.—A short anthology of Canadian lit. *New York*: Longmans, Green, 1927. xii + 160 pp. \$1.
- Labiche.—M. Perrichon, ed. M. Levi. *Chicago*: Sanborn, 1927. 223 pp. \$1.12.
- Lacome, C.—Fonotecnia francesa. *Valladolid*: Lozano, 1927. 240 pp. 10 ptas.
- Lima Barbosa.—Lamartine et le Brésil. *Paris*: Blanchard, 1927. Fr. 2.50
- Lockwood, H. D.—Tools and the man; the Fr. working-man and Eng. chartists in the lit. of 1830-48. *New York*: Columbia Press, 1927. ix + 244 pp. \$3.
- Magendie, M.—Du nouveau sur l'Astrée. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 463 pp. Fr. 60.
- L'Astrée, analyse et extraits. *Paris*: Perrin, 1927. Fr. 25.
- Marchand, L.—La famille Dupont. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. \$1.
- Margueritte, P.—Gens qui passent, ed. F. C. Green. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. 112 pp. 50 cts.
- Maurois, A.—Docteur O'Grady, ed. E. G. Le Grand. *New York*: Macmillan, 1926. xi + 121 pp. \$1.25.
- McCann, G. L.—Le sentiment de la nature en Fr. dans la première moitié du XVIIe s. *Paris* diss. *Nemours*: Lesot, 1926. 211 pp.
- Mercier, L.—Junior French. *New York*: Silver, 1927. xxviii + 376 pp. \$1.68.
- Millet, A.—Le traitement articulaire du groupe occlusive + nasale. Diss. *Paris*: Vrin, 1926. 76 pp.
- Recherches sur l'R d'une région du Haut Berry. Diss. *Paris*: Vrin, 1926. 188 pp.
- Molière.—L'Avare, ed. F. Anderson. *Boston*: Ginn, 1927. 184 pp. 64 cts.
- Montagnon.—Trois portraits de Montaigne. *Paris*: Guitard-Occitania, 1927. 150 pp. Fr. 12.
- Mornet, D.—Hist. de la litt. et de la pensée fr. contemporaines (1870-1925). *Paris*: Larousse, 1927. 261 pp.
- Nitze and Dargan.—Hist. of Fr. Lit. Revised ed. *New York*: Holt, 1927. xi + 818 pp. \$4.
- Normandy, G.—La fin de Maupassant. *Paris*: Michel, 1927. 266 pp. Fr. 15.
- Palmer, J. L.—Studies in the contemporary theatre. *New York*: Little, 1927. vii + 189 pp. \$2.75.
- Patch, R. H.—The Goddess Fortuna in mediaeval lit. *Cambridge*: Harvard Press, 1927. xii + 213 pp. \$5.00.
- Piron, A.—Œuvres complètes, ed. P. Dufay. 10 vols. *Paris*: Guillot, 1927.
- Plattard, J.—Anthologie du XVIIe s. fr. *New York*: Nelson, 1927. 256 pp.
- Plattard, J.—Anthologie du XVIe s. *London*: Nelson, 1927. 2 sh. 6 d.
- Pradez, E.—Dict. des gallicismes les plus usités. *Paris*: Payot, 1927. 396 pp. Fr. 20.
- Rudmose-Brown, T. B.—Fr. short stories. *New York*: Nelson, 1917. 224 pp.
- Roe, F. C.—La Fr. laborieuse. *New York*: Nelson, 1927. 176 pp.
- Rebald, A.—Malficeli, ed. R. P. Jago. *New York*: Heath, 1927. 148 pp. 80 cts.
- Ritchie, R. L. G.—A first Fr. bk. of poetry. *New York*: Nelson, 1927. 199 pp.
- Rogers, W. G.—Fluent Fr. for beginners. *Chicago*: Sanborn, 1927. 191 pp. \$1.12.
- Rousseau.—Correspondance gén. VIII. *Paris*: Colin, 1927. vi + 384 pp. Fr. 40.

Sherard, R. H.—Life of Maupassant. *New York*: Brentano, 1926. xvi + 399 pp. \$4.50.

Siciliano, I.—Dal romanticismo al simbolismo. Théodore de Banville, poeta, commediografo, prosatore (1823-1891). *Torino*: Fratelli Bocca, 1927. 471 pp. L. 40. (Letterature moderne, vol. 14.)

Sonnet, E.—Voltaire et l'influence anglaise. Diss. *Rennes*: Ouest-Eclair, 1926. 210 pp.

Stewart, D. L.—Anatole France, the Parisian. *New York*: Dodd, Mead, 1927. xiv + 394 pp.

Turner, Robert.—Didon dans la tragédie de la Renaissance ital. et fr. Diss. *Paris*: Fouillot, 1926. 143 pp.

Urfé, H. d'.—L'Astree, éd. p. H. Vaganay 3me partie. *Lyons*: Masson, 1927. 714 pp.

Veuillot, F.—Louis Veuillot. *Paris*: Edit. Spes, 1927. 227 pp. Fr. 5.

Wessely, I. E.—Junior classic Fr. dict *Chicago*: Follett, 1927. 272 pp. \$1.

ITALIAN

Aganoor, Vittoria.—Poesie complete, a cura e con introduzione di L. Grilli. Terza edizione, premessavi una lettura tenuta dall'autrice al Collegio romano. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1927. lvii + 458 pp. L. 14.

Barbiera, R.—Nella gloria e nell'ombra: immagini e memorie dell'Ottocento. *Milano*: A. Mondadori, 1926. 388 pp. L. 30.

Bianco da Siena.—Laude mistiche, a cura di G. M. Monti. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1925. xxiv + 126 pp. L. 5. (Mistici, no. 6.)

Cento, V.—I viandanti e la mèta: E. Buonaiuti, G. Costa, G. Gentile, C. Guastella, R. Murri, A. Tilgher, E. Troilo, B. Varisco, P. Zanfrognini. Appendice: L'ideale cristiano nel pensiero di Leopardi. Conclusione: La mèta. Precede un saggio critico sull'autore di E. Troilo. *Torino*: Edizioni Barretti, 1927. xlv + 267 pp. L. 12.

Chiurlo, B.—Antologia della letteratura friulana, a cura di —. *Udine*: Libr. edit. Udinese, 1927. xv + 522 pp. L. 11.

Compagnoni, G.—Memorie autobiografiche. Per la prima volta edita a cura di A. Ottolini. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1927. xvi + 338 pp. L. 27.

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—Ettore Fieramosca ovvero La disfida di Barletta. *Firenze*: G. Nerbini, 1927. 245 pp. L. 10.

Della Croce, Giulio Cesare.—Astuzie sottilissime di Bertoldo, ecc. con l'aggiunta del suo testamento e altri detti sentenziosi:

De Rubertis, A.—Documenti manzoniani. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1926. 93 pp. L. 6. (Biblioteca rara: serie III, ni. 61-63.)

Donati, A.—Ugo Foscolo. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. 82 pp. (Profil, no. 89.)

Farinelli, A.—Il romanticismo del mondo latino. Vol. I, II, III. *Torino*: Fratelli Bocca, 1927. 3 vols., viii + 297, 304, 297 pp. L. 96. (Letterature moderne, ni. 15-17.)

Festa, N.—Saggio sull' "Africa" del Petrarca. *Palermo-Roma*: R. Sandron, 1926. viii + 129 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca Sandron di scienze e lettere, no. 113.)

Francesco, San.—I Fioretti di —; il Cantico del Sole: le Considerazioni sulle Stimmate Illustrazioni e fregi di D. Cambellotti. Pubblicata il 4 ottobre MCMXXVI, VII centenario della morte di S. Francesco. *Roma*: Edit. "San Francesco," 1926. Fol., xiii + 176 pp.

Giordano, O.—Ferdinando Russo: l'uomo, il poeta. *Napoli*: E. De Simone, 1927. 126 pp. L. 8.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Opere complete, edita dal municipio di Venezia nel II centenario della nascita. Vol. XXIII. Tragicommedie, vol. I. *Venezia*: Tip. Zanetti, 1926. 602 pp.

Levi, Eugenia.—Fiorita di canti tradizionali del popolo italiano, scelti nei vari dialetti e annotati da —. Con 50 melodie popolari tradizionali. Seconda edizione completa. *Firenze*: R. Bemporad e figlio, 1926. xiv + 383 pp. L. 20.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Le Istorie fiorentine. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1926. 530 pp. L. 6.50. (Collezione Salani: I classici, no. 40.)

Mameli, Goffredo.—Poesie, con introduzione e note di F. L. Mannucci. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C. 1927. lxxx + 164 pp. L. 13. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Manacorda, G.—Sinfonie e pastelli. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. 116 pp. L. 16.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Morale filosofica e morale religiosa. Pagine tratte dalle osservazioni sulla morale cattolica, a cura di V. Arangio-Ruiz. *Lanciano*: R. Carabba, 1927. 2 vols., 167, 124 pp. L. 3.50 each. (Cultura dell'anima, ni. 108-109.)

Marino, G. B.—La galleria. A cura di G. Battelli. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1926. viii + 184 pp. L. 4.50. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, no. 249.)

Mazzei, P.—La vita e le opere di Francesco Petrarca. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1927. vii

Meyer-Luebbe, W.—Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei dialetti toscani. Riduzione e traduzione di M. Bartoli e G. Braun, con aggiunte dell'autore e di E. G. Parodi. Nuova edizione curata da M. Bartoli. *Torino*: G. Chiantore, 1927. vi + 215 pp. L. 25.

Monti, Vincenzo.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da U. Fracchia. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1927. xi + 295 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no 35.)

Pananti, F.—Epigrammi e novelle galanti: poemetti, con introduzione di G. Raya. *Catania*: Libr. Tirelli di F. Guaitolini, 1927. vii + 200 pp. L. 15.

Pellico, Silvio.—Le mie prigioni. *Milano*: A. Barion, 1926. 191 pp. L. 2.

Pisani, Maria.—L'Italia nella "Commedia umana." *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1927. 108 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca rara: serie III, ni. 79-81.)

Pistelli, E.—Eroi, uomini e ragazzi. Prefazione di Benito Mussolini. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1927. xix + 356 pp. L. 12.

Schiaparelli, L.—Influenze straniere nella scrittura italiana dei secoli VIII e IX. Note paleografiche. *Roma*: Bibl. apostolica Vaticana, 1927. 72 pp. (Studi e testi, no. 47.)

Sforza Pallavicino, P.—Pensieri e profili, a cura di M. Zino. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1927. 206 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca rara: serie III, ni. 64-69.)

Skerlj, S.—Syntaxe du participe présent et du gérondif en vieil italien et en latin. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xxiv + 290 pp. Fr. 60. (Bibliothèque des Hautes études.)

Treves, E.—La "Vita nuova." Michelangelo. *Vercelli*: Tip. Gallardi, 1926. 86 pp. L. 4.50.

Vico, G. B.—Volume commemorativo nel secondo centenario della pubblicazione della "Scienza nuova" (1725-1925). *Milano*: Soc. edit. "Vita e pensiero," 1926. 206 pp. L. 12. (Pubblicazioni della Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Serie I: Scienze filosofiche, vol. X.)

Vitti, A.—Storie e storielle del teatro di prosa. *Milano*: Vecchi, 1926. 238 pp. L. 12.

SPANISH

Alcalá Galiano, A.—Recuerdos de un anciano. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. 545 pp. 3.50 ptas. (Biblioteca Clásica, VIII.)

Alemán, M.—Guzmán de Alfarache. Tomo I. Ed. y notas de S. Gili y Gaya. *Madrid*: La Lectura, 1926. 248 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, LXXIII.)

Allende Lezama, J.—Al margen del Quijote. *Buenos Aires*: Roldán y Cía., 1927. 192 pp.

Arnáiz, M. y Alcalde, B.—Diccionario manual de Filosofía. I. Vocabulario-Ideario. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1927. 659 pp. 18 ptas.

Barris Muñoz, R.—El primer libro de música impreso en España. *Cádiz*: Tip. Rodríguez de Silva, 1926. 8 hojas.

Boussagol, G.—Angel de Saavedra, duc de Rivas. Sa vie, son œuvre poétique. *Toulouse*: Imp. Ed. Privat, 1926. xi + 481 pp. (Thèse pour le doctorat ès lettres présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris.)

Calderón.—Autos sacramentales. Vol. II. Prólogo, ed. y notas de Angel Valbuena Prat. *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1927. lxxx + 248 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, LXXIV.)

Cascales, Muñoz, J.—Historia de la cuerda granadina cantada por algunos de sus nudos. *Madrid*: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1926. 38 pp. 5 ptas.

Castillejo, C. de.—Obras. Vol. I. Sermón de Amores. Diálogo de mujeres. Prólogo, ed. y notas de J. Domínguez Bordona. *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1926. 310 pp. 5 ptas. (Clásicos Castellanos, LXXII.)

Catálogo razonado de las obras impresas en Valladolid. 1481-1800. *Valladolid*: Imp. de la Casa Social Católica, 1926. 890 pp.

Cervantes.—Don Quijote. Ed. anotada por N. D. Benjumea. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1927. Dos tomos: 567 y 652 pp. con láminas. 300 ptas.

Corbière, A. S.—Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch and the French Theatre. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania, 1927. 95 pp. (Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 20.)

Cuentos de la Edad Media. *Madrid*: G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1927. 172 pp. 5 ptas.

Diccionario manual Español-Pámue y Pámue-Español, compuesto por Misioneros. *Madrid*: "Artes Gráficas," 1927. 483 pp. 4 ptas.

Espinosa, A. M.—Lecciones de Literatura Española. *Stanford University, Cal.*: Stanford University Press, 1927. xiv + 188 pp. (Stanford Spanish Series.)

Fentanes, B.—Tesoro del idioma castellano. Segunda ed. aumentada. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 244 pp. 4.50 ptas.

García Boiza, A.—Medallones salmantinos. Nueva serie. *Salamanca*: Est. tip. de Calatrava, 1926. iv + 142 pp. 5 ptas.

García Soriano, J.—Damián Salucio del Poyo. Nuevos datos biográficos, su testamento, el inventario de sus bienes y otros documentos inéditos. *Madrid*: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1927. 46 pp. 5 ptas.

—Don Luis Carrillo y Sotomayor y los orígenes del culteranismo. *Madrid*:

Tip. de la "Rev. de Archivos," 1927. 46 pp. 5 ptas.

Gauna, F. de.—Relación de las fiestas celebradas en Valencia con motivo del casamiento de Felipe III. Con una intr. bibliográfica de S. Carreres Zacarés. Vol. II. *Valencia*: Hijo de J. Vives Mora, 1927. 520 pp.

Genín, A.—El Robinsón español. Ms. de fines del s. XVIII, salvado de la destrucción y publicado con un prólogo, varias notas y un apéndice por. . . *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 288 pp. 6 ptas.

Gil Fagoaga, L.—El último sendero de Adolfo Bonilla. *Madrid*: Industrial Gráfica, 1926. 14 pp. 1 pta.

Giménez Caballero, E.—Los toros, las castañuelas y la Virgen. *Madrid*: Caro Raggio, 1927. 450 ptas.

González Ruano, C.—Breves notas sobre Julio Cejador. *Madrid*: Talleres Prensa Nueva, 1927. 43 pp. 1.50 ptas.

Lafora, G. R.—Don Juan, los milagros y otros ensayos. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 332 pp. 5 ptas.

Lavalle, E. R.—Crónicas bonaerenses. (Tradiciones porteñas de los siglos XVI y XVII.) *Buenos Aires*: Agencia Gral. de Librería y Publicaciones, 1927. 2 pesos. (Biblioteca Sol. II.)

Marcial Dorado, C.—Chispitas. Short Spanish Plays. *Boston*: Ginn and Co., 1927. viii + 226 pp.

Matienzo, C. and Crandon, L. B.—Leyendas de la Alhambra. *Boston*: Ginn & Co., 1927. viii + 270 pp. \$1.00.

Ortega y Gasset, J.—El espectador. Tomo V. *Madrid*: Revista de Occidente, 1927. 209 pp. 5 ptas.

Rodríguez Marín, F.—Miscelánea de Andalucía. Del Parnaso a la horca: La vida y la muerte de Alonso Álvarez de Soria.—Juan del Pueblo: Historia amorosa popular.—El "divino" Herrera y la condesa de Gelves.—La copla: estudio folklórico.—La cárcel en que se engendró el "Quijote." *Madrid*: s. i., 1927. 286 pp. 5 ptas.

Sánchez, F.—La Gringa. Ed. with introduction, exercises, notes and vocabulary by J. T. Lister and R. Richardson. *New York*: Knopf, 1927. xvii + 142 pp.

Scatori, S.—La idea religiosa en la obra de Benito Pérez Galdós. *Toulouse*: Imp. Ed. Privat, 1926. 134 pp. (Thèse de doctorat d'Université présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Toulouse.)

Torre Revello, J.—Contribución a la historia y bibliografía de la imprenta en Montevideo. *Buenos Aires*: Imp. de la Universidad, 1926. 15 pp. 3 ptas.

Valera, J.—Dafnis y Cloe. *Madrid*: Biblioteca Nueva, 1927. 243 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras escogidas, X.)

Valle Inclán, R.—El ruedo ibérico. Primera serie. Tomo I. La corte de los milagros. *Madrid*: Rivadeneyra, 1927. 372 pp. 6 ptas. (Obras completas, XXI.)

Vega, Lope de.—El castigo sin venganza. *Madrid*: Editora Internacional, 1927. 151 pp. 3 ptas.

—El mejor alcalde el rey. *Madrid*: Editora Internacional, 1927. 148 pp. 3 ptas.

Zabaleta, J. de.—El día de fiesta. Abreviado y anotado por A. R. Chaves. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. 189 pp. 0.60 ptas. (Biblioteca Universal, CIII.)

GENERAL

Berendssohn, Walter A.—Selma Lagerlöf. Heimat und Leben, Kunstlerschaft, Werke, Wirkung und Wert. *München*: A. Langen, 1927. 371 pp. M. 11.

Jordan, L.—Les idées, leurs rapports et le jugement de l'homme. *Genève*: L. S. Olschki, 1926. 234 pp. Fr. 20. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum." Serie II: Storia, letteratura, paleografia, vol. 6.)

Funke, Otto.—Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie. [Neujahrsblätter der Literarischen Gesellschaft Bern. N.F. 6. Hft.] *Bern*: A. Francke, 1927. 140 pp. Fr. 4.80.

Kühler, A.—Die romanischen und deutschen Örtlichkeitsnamen des Kantons Graubünden. Herausgegeben mit Unterstützung der Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1926. xii + 252 pp. M. 14. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, herausgegeben von W. Meyer-Lübke. III. Reihe: Wörterbücher, 4.)

Lugiatto, L.—Pazzi, squilibrati e delinquenti nelle opere dei letterati. Vol. I: Guglielmo Shakespeare e le sue Masterpieces: Amleto, Macbeth, Re Lear, Othello. Con prefazione del prof. E. Morselli. Arte, psicologia e critica. *Bergamo*: C. Conti e C., 1926. xx + 227 pp. L. 12.

Ordbog over det Danske Sprog grundlagt af Verner Dahlerup, . . . udgivet af det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. Niende Bind: I—Kansler. *København*: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1927. 1215 pp. 4°.

Scandinavian Studies, vol. IX, no. 8, (Publications of the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies). *Menasha, Wis.*, 1927. Pp. 37.

Taylor, Archer.—The Black Ox. A Study in the History of a Folk-tale. [FF Communications No. 70]. *Helsinki*: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1927. 91 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Ault, Norman (ed.).—Seventeenth Century Lyrics. *New York*: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928. Pp. x + 524. \$3.50.

Chambers, R. W.—The Saga and the Myth of Sir Thomas More. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. 52. \$0.85.

Clive, Mrs. Archer.—Nine Poems by V. London: The Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. xxiv + 20. 5 s. 6 d.

Dickinson, John (Tr.).—The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury. *New York*: Knopf, 1927.

Ernle, Lord.—The Light Reading of our Ancestors. *New York*: Brentano's, 1927. Pp. ix + 326.

Fulcher, P. M. (ed.).—Descriptive Passages. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. Pp. xii + 249. \$1.50.

Graves, H. F., and Spotts, C. B.—The Art of Argument. *New York*: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1927. Pp. xi + 298. \$2.00

Jones, E. S.—Practice Leaves in the Rudiments of English. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. Pp. 76. \$0.65.

Margoliouth, H. M. (ed.).—The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. 2 Vols. \$10.50.

Merritt, Percival.—The True Story of the So-Called Love Letters of Mrs. Piozzi. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. 85.

Morley, Edith J. (editor).—The Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1927. Vols. I, II, pp. x + 904 (Continuous pagination).

Orrick, J. B.—Matthew Arnold and Goethe (Publications of the English Goethe Society, new series, Vol. IV). *London*: Alexander Moring, Limited, 1928. Pp. 54.

Pons, Emile (ed.).—Swift, Gulliver's Travels (extracts). *Paris*: Librairie Hachette, 1927. Pp. lxxxix + 396.

Ruhrmann, F. G.—Studien zur Geschichte und Charakteristik des Refrains in der englischen Literatur. (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 64.) *Hendelberg*: Carl Winter's Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1927.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, Bd. 63.—*Leipzig*: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1927. 315 S. M. 10.

Steeves, H. R.—Literary Aims and Art. *New York*: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1927. Pp. 245. \$1.88.

Thomas, M. G. L. (ed.).—The Poems of John Philips (The Percy Reprints, No. X). *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1927. Pp. lvii + 121. 8 s. 6 d.

Trechmann, E. J. (translator).—The Essays of Montaigne (Oxford Standard Authors). *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Vol. I, pp. 1 + 561; Vol. II, pp. 614. \$3.00.

Von Helmholtz-Phelan, A. A.—The Social Philosophy of William Morris. *Dunham, N. C.*: Duke University Press, 1927. Pp. 206. \$3.50.

Wyld, H. C.—A Short History of English. Third edition. Revised and enlarged. *New York*: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1927. Pp. vii + 294. \$2.50.

GERMAN

Arndt, Ernst Moritz.—Briefe an eine Freundin. Hrsg. von E. Gülzow. *Stuttgart*: Cotta, 1928 v, 240 pp. M. 5.

Auerbach, Lill.—Die Stellung der Frau in der sittlichen Weltanschauung Wilhelm Raabes. Diss. *Wureburg*: 1927. 95 pp.

Bökenkrüger, Wilh.—Das reflexive Verb in Ahd. Diss. *Gessen*: 1925. 95 pp.

Dohse, Richard.—Gustav Kohn. Sein Wesen u. Werk. *Leipzig*: F. W. Grunow [1927] 89 pp. M. 1.

Donat, Walther.—Die Landschaft bei Tieck und ihre historischen Voraussetzungen. Diss. *Berlin*: 1925. VIII, 137 pp.

Dufhus, Elisabeth.—Tristandichtungen des 19. u. 20. Jahrhunderts. Diss. *Köln*: 1925. 64 pp.

Ernst, Paul.—Der Weg zur Form. Abhandlungen über die Technik, vornehmlich der Tragödie und Novelle. [Gesammelte Werke, Abt. 3, Bd. 1]. *München*: Georg Müller, 1928. 451 pp. M. 8.

Farinelli, A.—Poesia germanica. *Milano*: Edizioni "Corbaccio," 1927. 519 pp. L. 22. (Cultura contemporanea: biblioteca di letteratura, storia e filosofia, No 17.)

Gallwitz, Sophie D.—Der neue Dichter und die Frau. *Berlin*: F. A. Herbig, 1927. 183 pp. M. 6.50.

Gerring, Hugo.—Die unbestimmten Pronomina auf -ein im Alt- und Mittelhochdeutschen bis zum Anfang des 14 Jhs. Diss. *Uppsala*: Almqvist & Wicksells Boktryckeri, 1927. 176 pp.

Goethe.—Die Weimarische Dramaturgie. Aus Goethes Schriften gesammelt, erl. u. eingel. von E. Scharrer-Santen. *Berlin*: Paetel [1927]. viii, 328 pp. M. 7.

Gross, Carl.—Frauentaschenbuch (Fouqués und das Frauentaschenbuch). Diss. *Münster*: 1925. 54 pp.

Grosser, Helmut.—Die Breslauer Liederhandschrift von 1603. Diss., Teildruck. *Breslau*: 1925. 23 pp.

Hartl, Eduard.—Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival. Die jüngern *G-Handschriften. 1. Abt.: Die Wiener Mischhandschriftengruppe *W. [Germanisch und Deutsch, Studien zur Sprache und Kultur, 1. Hft.] *Berlin*: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1928. xxiii, 163 pp.

Hohenstein, F. A.—Schiller. Die Metaphysik seiner Tragödie. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1927. vii, 181 pp. M. 10.

Houben, H. H.—J. P. Eckermann, sein Leben für Goethe. Nach seinen neugefundenen Tagebüchern und Briefen dargestellt. Tl. 2. *Leipzig*: Haessel, 1928. xxii, 807 pp. M. 10.

Jacoby-Goldstandt, Margot.—Die deutschen Dramatiker im Kampf um den Lohn ihrer Arbeit. Diss. *Berlin*: 1927. 81 pp.

John, Hans.—Goethe und die Musik. [Musikalisches Magazin, H. 73]. *Langensala*: H. Beyer & Sohne, 1928. vii, 175 pp. M. 4.50.

Korff, H. A.—Geist der Goethezeit. Versuch einer ideellen Entwicklung der klassromantischen Literaturgeschichte. Tl. 2. Klassik, Buch 1. *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1927. vi, 117 pp. M. 4.

Linacher, A.—Walthier von der Vogelweide, poeta nazionale germanico e il suo monumento a Bolzano. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1927. viii + 94 pp. L. 6.

Maione, I.—Hölderlin; con una scelta delle liriche tradotte. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1927. xii + 134 pp. L. 10.

Pernice, Magdalena.—Drei Gleichendramen aus der Zeit des deutschen Idealismus. Diss. *Greifswald*: 1925. 203 pp.

Reuter, Gabriele.—Eines Toten Wiederkehr. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by Taylor Starck. *New York*: A. A. Knopf, 1928. xi, 90 pp.

Saul, Carl Theodor.—Studien zu Meister Stephans Schachbuch. Diss. *Münster*: 1926. 47 pp.

Salomon, Gerhard.—E. T. A. Hoffmann. Bibliographie. 2., verb. u. verm. Aufl. [Paetels Handbücher, Bd. 1]. *Berlin*: Gebr. Paetel, 1927. 118 pp. M. 5.

Sauter, Ferd.—Leben und Gedichte. Dargest. u. hrsg. v. H. Deissinger u. O. Pfeiffer. Neue, wohlfr. Ausg. *Wien*: Gerold, 1927. IX, 327 pp. M. 5.

Spiero, Heinr.—Raabe-Lexikon. *Berlin-Grünwald*: H. Klemm [1927]. 278 pp. M. 5.75.

Stern, Hildegard.—Friedrich Hebbels "Judith" auf der deutschen Bühne. [Hebbel-Forschungen. Nr. 18.] *Berlin*: B. Behr, 1927. 120 pp. M. 4.50.

Strich, Fritz.—Dichtung und Zivilisation. *München*: Meyer & Jessen, 1928. VII, 251 pp. M. 5.

Trenkler, Klara.—Studien über den Gebrauch des Partizips in Goethes Dichtersprache. [Prace Filologiczne T. XI.] *Warsaw*: 1927. Pp. 290-429.

Trube, Hans.—Friedrich Gottlob Wetzels Leben und Werk. Mit bes. Berücksichtigung seiner Lyrik. Diss. Teildruck. *Frankfurt*: 1926. 35 pp.

Wall, Heinrich.—Die Entwicklung der deutschen Dichtung im 18. Jahrh. und die Männer des Braunschweiger Kreises. Diss. *Freiburg i. Br.*: 1925. 135 pp.

Winter, Leo.—Die deutsche Schatzsage. Diss. *Köln*: 1925. 96 pp.

Ziegler, H. Willi.—Friedrich Schlegels Jugendentwicklung. [S. A. Arch. f. d. ges. Psych.] *Leipzig*: 1927. 128 pp.

Zinke, Paul.—Paul Heysses Novellentechnik. Dargestellt auf Grund einer Untersuchung der Novelle "Zwei Gefangene." [Geleitet von R. Kayser.] *Karlsruhe*: F. Gutsch [1927]. 278 pp. M. 7.50.

FRENCH

Andeh, H. d'—The Battle of the seven arts, a Fr. poem by a trouvère of the thirteenth century, ed. L. J. Paetow. *Berkeley*: Univ. of Cal. Press. 60 pp. and 10 plates. 75 cts. [Memoirs of the U. of Cal., IV, 1.]

Atkinson, G.—La littérature géographique de la Renaissance. *Paris*: Picard, 1927. 600 pp. 250 Fr.

Bazin.—Les Oberlé ed. I. H. B. Spiers and M. C. Churchill. *Boston*: Heath, 1927. iv + 235 pp. 88 cts.

Beaulieu, C.—Vie et travaux de Burgaud des Marets. *Paris*: Edit. Rupella, 1927. 320 pp. Fr. 35

Bonnard, G.—Manuel de phonétique fr. *Lausanne*: Payot, 1927. 112 pp.

Boron, R. de.—Le Roman de l'estoire dou graal, éd. W. A. Nitze. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xv + 137 pp. Fr. 8.50. Classiques fr. du moyen âge.

Busnelli, M. D.—Stendhal traducteur de Goldoni. *Paris*: Stendhal-Club, 1927. 16 pp.

Charvet, L.—Glances de France en automne. Lecture et récitation. *Boston*: Ginn, 1928. xii + 212 pp. \$1.20.

Dietz, J.—M. Barrès. *Paris*: Renaissance du livre, 1927. 156 pp. Fr. 6.

Dubech, L.—La Comédie-Fr. d'aujourd'hui. *Paris*: Le Divan, 1927. 106 pp. Fr. 12.

Engel, E.—Geschichte der franz. Lit. *Leipzig*: Brandstetter, 1927. viii + 556 pp. M. 10.

Ettmayer, K.—Zur Lehre von den paraktischen Konjunktionen im Franz. *Vienna*: Höllder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1927. 66 pp. M. 2 50.

Fouché, P.—Etudes de phonétique générale. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. 132 pp. \$2.10.

France, A.—Abeille et autres contes, ed. G. N. Henning. *Boston*: Heath, 1928. vii + 260 pp. \$1.08.

Grosjean, G.—Le sentiment national dans la Guerre de Cent Ans. *Paris*: Bossard, 1927. 236 pp. Fr. 15.

John of Garland.—Morale scolarium, ed. by L. J. Paetow. *Berkley*: Univ. of Cal. Press, 197 pp. and 4 plates \$4.25. [Memoirs of the U. of Cal., IV, 2.]

Heuschle, O.—Maurice de Guérin. *Stuttgart*: Haug, 1927. M. 5.

Krappe, A. H.—Balor with the evil eye. Studies in Celtic and Fr. lit. *New York*: Columbia Press, 1927. vii + 229 pp. \$2.25. [Institut des études fr.]

Lacour, L.—Molière acteur. *Paris*: Alcan, 1927. 149 pp. Fr. 15.

Marguerite de Navarre.—Les dernières poésies, pub. pour la première fois avec introd. et notes d'A. Lefranc. *Paris*: Colin, 1927. Fr. 28.

Renieu, L.—Hist. des théâtres de Bruxelles. 2 vols. *Paris*: Duchartre, 1927. Fr. 145.

Rimestad, C.—Baudelaire. *Copenhagen*: Gyldendal, 1927. Kr. 8.50.

Ritter, R.—Lettres et poésies de Catherine de Bourbon (1570-1603). *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xiii + 232 pp. Fr. 30.

Schapiro, I.—Der Antisemitismus in der franz. Lit. E. Drumont u. s. Quellen. *Berlin*: Philo-Verlag u. Buchh., 1927. 140 pp. M. 3.25.

Schüler, G.—Studien zu R. Rolands Colas Breugnon. Diss. *Marburg*: 1927. 43 pp.

Simon, C.—Le sillage de Stendhal en Allemagne. *Paris*: Stendhal-Club, 1927. 32 pp.

Taillandier, Mme. S.-R.—Racine. *Paris*: Plon, 1927. 128 pp. Fr. 6.

Van Bellen, E. C.—Les origines du mélodrame. Amsterdam diss. *Utrecht*: Kemink & Zoon, 1927. 215 pp.

Vigny—Oeuvres. Théâtre II, ed. F. Baldensperger. *Paris*: Conard, 1927. 391 pp. Fr. 30.

Weil, F.—Hugo et Wagner. Leurs conceptions dramatiques. Diss. *Berne*: 1927. 139 pp.

Wilcox, F. H.—Prévost's translations of Richardson's novels. *Berkely*: U. of Cal. Press, 1927. 70 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Phil.)

ITALIAN

Alghieri, Dante.—Eclogues. The poetical correspondence between Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio. *Boston*: Cornhill, 1927. 48 pp. \$2.00.

—La Divina Commedia, commentata da G. A. Venturi. II: Il Paradiso. *Milano*: Signorelli, 1926.

Battelli, G.—Florilegio francescano. Prose e poesie francescane, inedite o rare, raccolte, ordinate e illustrate da —. (S. Bonaventura, Vita di S. Francesco. Tommaso da Celano, Vita di S. Chiara d'Assisi. Beato Giovanni da Parma, Meditazione della povertà di S. Francesco. Beata Angiola da Foligno, La via della Croce. S. Bernardino da Siena, Prediche. Jacopone da Todi, Ugo Panziera, Francesco Degli Albizi, Laudi francescane.) *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1926. xvi + 314 pp. L. 10.60.

Bonardi, D.—Il cuore deserto. Misura dei valori spirituali del nostro tempo. Prefazione di V. Brocchi. *Milano*: Casa edit. sociale, 1926. 231 pp. L. 8.

Cerio, E.—Aria di Capri. *Napoli*: G. Cassella, 1927. 533 pp. L. 20.

Croce, Benedetto.—Pagine sparse, raccolte da G. Castellano. Serie IV. Politica e letteratura, ricordi di vita ministeriale. *Napoli*: R. Ricciardi, 1927. 142 pp. L. 7.

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—Ettore Fieramosca ossia La disfida di Barletta, a cura e con note di E. Allodoli. *Venezia*: "La nuova Italia," 1927. xvi + 365 pp. L. 9. (Scrittori italiani.)

De Francia Criscione, Melina.—De partu Virginis di Jacopo Sannazaro. *Ragusa Ibla*: Tip. V. Criscione, 1926. 79 pp.

Dominici, Beato Giovanni.—Regola del governo di cura familiare. Con prefazione di P. Bargellini. *Firenze*: Libr. edit. Fiorentina, 1927. xviii + 149 pp. L. 5.50. (I libri della fede, no. 28.)

Foscolo, Ugo.—Il carne dei "Sepolcri," con discorso preliminare e commento di E. Mestica. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1927. 68 pp. L. 7.

Gonzaga, Santo Luigi.—Lettere ed altri scritti raccolti e annotati da E. Rosa. *Firenze*: Libr. edit. Fiorentina, 1926. lv + 197 pp. L. 7.50. (I libri della fede, no. 27.)

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Poesie giovanili. Prefazione e note di A. Salucci. *Milano*: Edizioni "Lavinia," 1926. xii + 161 pp. L. 18. (Varietà storiche e letterarie, no. 1.)

Monti, Vincenzo.—Liriche, tragedie e poemi. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1926. 768 pp. L. 6.50. (Collezione Salani: i Classici, no. 36.)

—Tragedie, poemetti, liriche, a cura di G. F. Gobbi. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1927. xxviii + 502 pp. L 18. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.)

Morello, V.—Dante, Farinata, Cavalcanti. Lettura nella Casa di Dante in Roma. *Milano-Verona*: A Mondadori, 1927. 71 pp. L 15.

Oțetea, A.—François Guichardin. Sa vie publique et sa pensée politique. Thèse pour le doctorat ès lettres présentée à la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Paris, par —. *Paris*: Picart, 1926. xxvii + 393 pp.

Pascoli, Giovanni.—Nuovi poemetti. Settima edizione. *Bologna*: N. Zamichelli, 1927. xii + 223 pp. (Poesie di Giovanni Pascoli, no. 3)

Salimbene, Fra.—La cronaca, a cura di G. Pochettino. Con illustrazioni di A. Razzolini. *Sancasciano-Pesa*: Soc. edit. Toscana, 1926. xlv + 248 pp. L 15.

Villari, Pasquale.—Niccolò Machiavelli e i suoi tempi. Quarta edizione, postuma, a cura di M. Scherillo. Vol. I e II. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1927. 2 vols., xvi + 681, 683 pp. L 60.

Walser, E.—Lebens- und Glaubensprobleme aus dem Zeitalter der Renaissance. Die Religion des Luigi Pulci, ihre Quellen und ihre Bedeutung. *Marburg*: N. G. Elwert, 1926. 88 pp. M. 3.50. (Die neueren Sprachen, 10. Beiheft.)

SPANISH

Alonso Getino, L. G.—Origen del Rosario y leyendas castellanos del siglo XIII sobre Santo Domingo de Guzmán. *Vergara*: Tip. de "El Santísimo Rosario," 1925. xxi + 273 pp.

Avila, J.—Obras del beato maestro. . . . *Madrid*: Rivadeneyra, 1927. 2199 pp. 12 ptas.

Biancolini, L.—Letture spagnuole. Con note ed esercizi di conversazione per il primo e secondo anno di studio. *Roma*: A. Signorelli [1925?]. 240 pp.

Calderón.—Poesías inéditas. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. 189 pp. 0.60 ptas. (Colección Universal, LXXI.)

Danvila, A.—El Archiduque en Madrid. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe [1927]. Dos tomos, 240 y 332 pp. 10 ptas. (Las luchas fraticidas de España.)

El Empecinado visto por un inglés.—Tr. y pról. de G. Marañón. *Madrid*: Raté, 1926. 218 pp.

Fernández de Moratín, N. y L.—Obras. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. xxxviii + 636 pp. 12 ptas. (B. A. E., II.)

Green, O. H.—The life and works of Lu-

percio Leonardo da Argensola. *Philadelphia*: University of Pennsylvania, 1927. 203 pp.

Hall, E. J., and Aguilera, F.—Introducción a la historia de la América Latina. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. vii + 172 pp. \$1.25.

Lazarillo de Tormes.—Ed. by A. Alexis. *Lincoln, Neb.*: Midwest Book Company, 1927. xi + 139 pp. \$1.00.

Lemus y Rubio, P.—Ejercicios literarios de análisis y composición, Tercera ed. *Murcia*. Jiménez, 1926. viii + 259 pp.

Manrique, J.—Coplas y sus glosas. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1926. 1.75 ptas. (Letras Españolas, XII.)

Marguina, E.—Las flores de Aragón. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by S. E. Leavitt. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. xxii + 222 pp. \$1.25.

Obligado, C.—La cueva del fósil. Diálogos increíbles sobre la vida literaria argentina. *Buenos Aires*: Talleres Gráficos Index, 1927. 236 pp. Pesos 2.50.

Palacio Valdés, A.—Riverita. Ed. with introduction, notes, exercises and vocabularies by J. E. A. Alexis. *Lincoln*: Midwest Book Co., 1928. xiv + 269 pp. \$1.25.

Pereda, J. M. de.—Sotileza. Novena ed. *Madrid*: V. Suárez, 1927. 574 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras Completas, IX.)

Quevedo.—Historia de la vida del Buscón. Ed. crítica por R. Selden Rose. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. 405 pp. 9 ptas.

Quintana.—Vidas de los españoles célebres. Tomo I. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1927. xiii + 503 pp. 3.50 ptas. (Biblioteca Clásica, XII.)

Rancés, A.—Diccionario de la Lengua española. *Barcelona*: Sopena, 1926. 768 pp. (800 grabados.) 3.50 ptas.

Salazar y Roig, S.—Curso de Historia de la literatura española. Tres vols. *Habana*: "El Siglo XX," 1925-1926. 141, 286 y 151 pp.

Sánchez, T. A.—Poetas castellanos anteriores al siglo XV. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. xlviii + 600 pp. 12 ptas. (B. A. E., LVII.)

Trueba y Cossío, T. de.—España romántica. I. *Madrid*: Ed. Voluntad [1927]. 103 pp. 1.75 ptas. (Letras españolas, XXI.)

Un teatro de arte en España, 1917-1925. Vol. I. *Madrid*: Ediciones de La Esfinge, 1926. 198 pp. 49 reproducciones tiradas aparte, 68 intercaladas en el texto, 36 grabados en negro y 49 heliotipias. 125 ptas.

Valdés, J. de.—Diálogo de las lenguas [sic]. Ed. with Introduction and Appendices by J. H. Perry. *London*: University of London Press, 1927. 198 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GERMAN

Behaghel, Otto.—Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung. Bd. III: Die Satzgebilde. [Germanische Bibliothek, 1. Abt., 1. Reihe: Grammatiken, 10vi]. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1928. xii, 823 pp. M. 26.

Benjamin, Walter.—Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels. *Berlin*: E. Rowohlt, 1928. 258 pp. M. 8.

Berthold, Luise.—Hessen-Nassauisches Volkswörterbuch aus den für ein Hessen-Nassauisches Wbch. von Ferd. Wrede angelegten u. verwalteten Sammlungen ausgew. u. bearb. (Etwa 30 Lfgn.) Lfg. 1 = Bd. 2, Bogen 1-4 (la bis laut). *Marburg*: Elwert, 1927. vii, 64 cols., 4°. M. 2.50.

Bohnenberger, Karl.—Die Mundarten Württembergs. Eine heimatkundliche Sprachlehre. [Schwabische Volkskunde. Buch 4]. *Stuttgart*: Silberburg, 1928. xii, 112 pp. M. 4.50.

Bork, Hans.—Chronologische Studien zu Otfriids Evangelienbuch. [Palaestra. 157]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1927. viii, 202 pp. M. 16.

Calsow, Rosine.—Die Methode der frühromantischen Kunstkritik. [Germanische Studien, H. 53]. *Berlin*: E. Ebering, 1927. 112 pp. M. 4.40.

Carlson, Alice.—Ulrich Fuetrer und sein "Iban." Münchener Diss. *Riga*: A. Nitawsky, 1927. 199 pp. M. 5.

Christa, Peter.—Wörterbuch der Trierer Mundart mit Sprachgesetzen derselben und Sprachproben in Prosa und Poesie, verf. u. hrsg. unter Mitarb. d. Vereins "Trierisch." Tl. 1. *Honnef a. Rh.*: Siebengebirgs-Buchh. 1927. ix, 119 pp. M. 5.

Christmann, E.—Der Lautbestand des Rheinfränkischen u. s. Wandel in der Mundart von Kaulbach (Pfalz). [Veröffentl. d. Pfälz. Ges. z. Förderung d. Wissenschaften, Bd. 2]. *Speyer*: D. E. Jaeger in Komm., 1927. vii, 108 pp. M. 3.

Danton, George H.—Germany ten years after. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1928. 295 pp. \$3.50.

Dollinger, Herm. F.—Platens Antlitz. Bildnisse und zeitgenössische Berichte über die persönliche Erscheinung Platens. Mit Einf. v. W. Scheller. [Schriften der Platen-Gesellschaft, 2.] *Erlangen*: Platen-Gesellschaft, 1927. 72 pp. M. 2

Emrich, Hermann.—Goethes Intuition. [Heidelb. Abhandlungen zur Philos. u. ihrer Geschichte, 14]. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1928. iii, 82 pp. M. 3.60.

Florin, Marie.—Paul Ernst als Novellist. Diss. *Münster*: 1925. 74 pp.

Forchhammer, Jorgen.—Kurse Einführung in die deutsche und allgemeine Sprachlehre (Phonetik). [Indogerm. Bibl. 2. Abt. Sprachwissenschaftliche Gymnasialbibliothek 10]. *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1928. M. 2 90.

Geissler, H. W.—Gestaltungen des Faust. Die bedeutendsten Werke der Faustdichtung seit 1587. 3 Bde. 1. Die vogoethische Zeit. 2. Goethes Faust. 3. Die nachgoethische Zeit. *München*: Parcus & Co. [1927]. 631; 555; 553 pp. M. 10.

Gelpcke, Ernst.—Fichte und die Gedankenwelt des Sturm und Drang. Eine ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Ergründung der Wurzeln des deutschen Idealismus. *Leipzig*: F. Meiner, 1928. viii, 308 pp. M. 10.

Glaser, Rudolf.—Rudolf Heubner und seine Dichtung. *Leipzig*: L. Staackmann, 1927. 70 pp. 3 plates. 80 Pf.

Grimm, Brüder.—Märchen. Urfassung nach der Orig. Hs. d. Abtei Olenberg im Elsass. Hrsg. von Jos. Lefftz. [Schriften d. Elsass-Lothring. Wissenschaftl. Gesellschaft zu Strassburg. Reihe C, Bd. 1]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1927. 180 pp. 4°. M. 6.

Hartmann, Fritz.—Wilhelm Raabe. Wie er war und wie er dachte. Gedanken und Erinnerungen. 2., durchges. u. verm. Aufl. *Hannover*: A. Sponholtz, 1927. 101 pp. M. 3.50.

Hauptmann, Carl.—Leben mit Freunden. Ges. Briefe. (Hrsg. von Will-Erich Peuckert). *Berlin-Grünwald*: Horen-Verlag, 1928. 426 pp. M. 5.50.

Herford, C. H.—The Post-War Mind of Germany and other European Studies. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. 248 pp. \$3.50.

Hillern, Wilhelmine v.—Höher als die Kirche. Ed. with Introd., Notes, Exercises, and Vocab. by Eleonore C. Nippert. *New York*: A. A. Knopf, 1928. vi, 119 pp.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo v.—Wert und Ehre deutscher Sprache. In Zeugnissen hrsg. *München*: Bremer Presse, 1927. 293 pp. M. 10.

Kellermann, Fritz.—The Effect of the World War on European Education with special attention to Germany. [Harvard Bulletins in Education, No. XIII.]. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1928. xiii, 89 pp. \$1.00.

Klein, Karl Kurt.—Beziehungen Martin Opitzens zum Rumänentum. [S.-A. aus Korrespondenzblatt d. Ver. f. siebenbürg. Landeskunde, Jg. 50, Nr. 7. 8.] *Hermannstadt*: Krafft & Drotleff, 1927. 30 pp. M. 2.

Knevels, Wilh.—Gustav Schuler als religiöser Dichter. *Stuttgart*: Cotta, 1928. 58 pp. 80 Pf.

Konrad der Pfaffe.—Das Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad. Hsg. von Carl Wesle. [Rhein. Beitr. u. Hulfsbücher, Bd. 15]. *Bonn*: F. Klopp, 1928. lxx, 326 pp. M. 10.

Kranzmayer, Eberhard.—Die schwabisch-bairischen Mundarten am Lechraim mit Berucks. d. Nachbarmundarten [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. Jg. 1927, Abt. 5]. *München*: R. Oldenbourg, 1927. 18 pp. 80 Pf.

Lasch, Agathe.—"Berlinisch." Eine berlinische Sprachgeschichte. [Berlinische Forschungen, Bd. 2]. *Berlin*: R. Hobbing [1928]. xii, 354 pp. M. 12.

Leppla, Rupprecht.—Wilhelm Meinhold und die chronikalische Erzählung. [Germanische Studien, H. 54]. *Berlin*: E. Ebering, 1928. 168 pp. M. 6.60.

Liptzin, Solomon.—Lyric Pioneers of Modern Germany. Studies in German Social Poetry. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1928. 187 pp. \$2.75.

Meridies, Wilh.—Hermann Bahr als epischer Gestalter und Kritiker der Gegenwart. *Hildesheim*: F. Borgmeyer [1927]. 69 pp. M. 1.50.

Metzger, W.—Die Entwicklung von Lessings Briefstil. = Anni Pfeifer, Beiträge zur Laut- und Formenlehre der Mainzer Mundart. [Giessener Beiträge, 19]. *Giessen*: v. Munchow, 1927. 67 pp. M. 3.

Milch, Werner.—Gustav Adolf in der deutschen und schwedischen Literatur. (Veränderte Fassung einer gekr. Preisschrift). [Germ. Abhandlungen, H. 59]. *Breslau*: Marcus, 1928. xii, 136 pp. M. 7.20.

Murner, Thomas.—Kleine Schriften (Prosa-schriften gegen die Reformation). Tl. 1. Ein christl. und briedlerl. ermanung, Von Doctor Martinus luters leren und prodigen. Hrg. von W. Pfeiffer-Belli. [Murner, Deutsche Schriften mit den Holzschnitten der Erstdrucke. Bd. 6]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1927. viii, 200 pp. M. 10.

Nadler, Josef.—Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften. Bd. 4. Der deutsche Staat (1814-1914). 1. u. 2. Aufl. Nebst Raumzeitafel. *Regensburg*: Habel, 1928. xv, 1012 pp. M. 22.

Obergbergische Sprachproben.—Mundartliches aus Eckenhausen u. Nachbarschaft Unter Mitwirkung von D. Rippel, O. Kaufmann u. W. Schöler, hrg. v. Theod. Branscheid. Bd. 1. *Eckenhausen, Kr. Waldbrol*: Selbstverlag [1927]. iv, 169 pp. M. 4.50.

Ritzen, Renatus.—Der junge Sebastian Brunner in seinem Verhältnis zu Jean Paul,

Anton Günther und Furst Metternich *Leipzig*: F. Volckmar, 1927. xvi, 190 pp. M. 6.

Sass, Johannes.—Die Sprache des nieder-deutschen Zimmermanns dargestellt auf Grund der Mundart von Blankenese (Holstein). [Sprache und Volkstum, Arbeiten zur niederdeutschen Sprachgeschichte und Volkskunde, I]. *Hamburg*: K. Wachholtz, 1927. xix, 148 pp.

Schäfer, Wilhelm.—Lebensabriss. 3. Aufl. *München*. G. Müller, 1928. 84 pp. M. 2.

—Bekennnis zu—. Zum 60. Geburtstag des Dichters am 20. Jan. 1928. Hrg. von Otto Doderer *München*: Georg Müller, 1928. 96 pp. M. 2.50.

Studies in Philology.—Second Volume. (Publications of the Yiddish Scientific Institute, II). *Vilno*: B. Kletskin, 1928. xxix pp. (English) + vii pp. + 517 col. (Yiddish).

Tröthandl-Berghaus, Alice.—Die Dramen des Martin Hayneccius. [Deutsche Kultur, Literarhist. Reihe]. *Wien*. Osterr. Bundesverl., 1927. 155 pp. M. 7.30.

Weichberger, Alex.—Goethe und das Komödienhaus in Weimar 1779-1825. Ein Beitrag zur Theaterbaugeschichte [Theatergeschichtl. Forschungen. 39.]. *Leipzig*: Leop. Voss, 1928. viii, 134 pp. M. 8.

Weingartner Liederhandschrift, Die, in Nachbildung. Mit Begleitwort von Karl Löffler. *Stuttgart*: Omnitypie Gesellschaft Nachf., 1927. 313 faks. Seiten, 16 Seiten Text. M. 68.

Wentscher, Erich.—Die Rufnamen des deutschen Volkes. Eine Studie. Mit einem Verzeichnis unserer gebräuchlichen Rufnamen nebst deren Wortsinn. *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1928. 52 pp. M. 2.40.

FRENCH

Allotte de La Fuye.—J. Verne. *Paris*: Kra, 1928. 290 pp. Fr. 16.50.

Alméras, H. d'.—Le Tartuffe de Molière. *Paris*: Malfère, 1928. 208 pp. Fr. 9.

Anglade, J.—Les Troubadours de Toulouse. *Paris*: Didier, 1928. 218 pp. Fr. 12.

Anthologie de la nouvelle poésie fr. *Paris*: Kra, 1927. 450 pp. Fr. 30.

Anthologie de la nouvelle prose fr. *Paris*: Kra. Fr. 25.

Austin, Cecil.—The immortal Ninon. *New York*: Brentano's, 1928. 269 pp. \$3.50.

Baale-Tittenbosch, A. E. M.—Les poëtesses dolentes du romantisme. Amsterdam diss. *Haarlem*: Bohn, 1928. 296 pp.

Bateman, G. C.—Phonetics without symbols. *Cambridge, Eng.*: Heffer, 1928. 46 pp. 1 sh.

Bauche, H.—Le langage populaire. *Paris*: Payot, 1928. 256 pp.

Bouteron, M.—Danse et musique romantiques. *Paris*: Le Goupy, 1927. 188 pp. Fr. 80

Benoit-Lévy.—La jeunesse de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Michel, 1928. 400 pp. Fr. 25.

Bossuet.—Lettres, éd. H. Massis *Paris*: Tallandier, 1928. 360 pp. Fr. 16.

Brousseau, J. J.—Itinéraire de Paris à Buenos-Ayres, épilogue d'A. France en pantoufles. *Paris*: Ciès, 1927. 340 pp. Fr. 12.

Carré, J.-M.—Les Deux Rimbaud. *Paris*: Cahiers libres, 1928. Fr. 20.

Causeret, Ch.—Ce qu'il faut connaître de Rabelais. *Paris*: Boivin, 1928. 160 pp. Fr. 7.

Chastellier.—Lamartine et ses nièces. *Paris*: Plon, 1928. 228 pp. Fr. 12.

Chinard, G.—Petite histoire des lettres fr. *Boston*: Ginn, 1928. viii + 328 pp. \$1.48.

Clément and Macirone.—Je lis et je parle. *Boston*: Heath, 1928. x + 202 pp. \$1.16.

Desfeuilles, P.—C. Monselet et la critique anecdotique. *Paris*: P. Roger, 1928. 362 pp. Fr. 40.

Dumesnil, R.—La publ. de Mme Bovary. *Paris*: Malfère, 1928. 144 pp. Fr. 9.

Faÿ, B.—Panorama de la litt. fr. contemp. *Paris*: Kra, 1927.

Gadala, M. T.—Ceux que j'aime. De Barrès à Morand. *Paris*: Figuière, 1928. 256 pp. Fr. 12

Garnier, M. R.—H. James et la France. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 216 pp. Fr. 35.

Gautier, T.—Selections, ed. by A. Schaffer and S. A. Rhodes. *New York*: Century, 1928. xix + 185 pp.

Gillet, R. P.—P. Valéry et la métaphysique. *Paris*: Tour d'Ivoire. Fr. 50.

Giraud, V.—La vie chrétienne d'Eugénie de Guérin. *Paris*: Plon, 1928. 263 pp. Fr. 15.

Gottschalk, P. W.—Die humoristische gestalt in der franz. lit. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1928. 391 pp. M. 16.

Hallays, A.—Les Perrault. *Paris*: Perrin, 1927. Fr. 20.

—Les solitaires de Port Royal. *Paris*: Plon, 1927. Fr. 9

Hubert, L.—Deux Ardennais. H. Taine. A. Rimbaud. *Paris*: Messein, 1928. Fr. 3.

Hubert, R.—Rousseau et l'Encyclopédie. *Paris*: Gamber, 1928. 160 pp. Fr. 28.

Hytier, J.—Le roman romantique. L'Individu. *Paris*: Les Arts et le Livre. Fr. 12.

La Fontaine.—Œuvres, ed. J. Longnon. 10 vols. *Paris*: Cité des livres. Fr. 60.

Lallemand, P. de.—Montalembert et ses amis dans le romantisme. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 365 pp. Fr. 35.

—Montalembert et ses relations littéraires avec l'étranger jusqu'en 1830. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 112 pp. Fr. 25.

Lalou, R.—Défense de l'homme; la critique; idée de la poésie pure de Descartes à Proust *Paris*: Kra, 1927. Fr. 13.50.

Lanson, René.—Le goût du moyen âge en Fr. au XVIII s. *Paris*: Vanoest, 1927.

Launay, L. de.—Un amoureux de Mme Récamier, le journal de J.-J. Ampère. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 295 pp.

Le Breton, A.—La jeunesse de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Hachette, 1928. Fr. 12

Léger, C.—A la recherche de Balzac. *Paris*: Le Goupy, 1927.

Le Gras, J.—Diderot et l'Encyclopédie. *Paris*: Malfère, 1928. 176 pp. Fr. 9.

Lesage.—Turcaret, ed. E. E. Brandon and M. Baudin. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. xxiii + 163 pp. 85 cts.

Lucas-Dubreton.—La vie d'A. Dumas père. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. fr., 1928. Fr. 12.

Marmelstein, J. W.—Figuren uit de Fransche letterkunde. *Amsterdam*: U. M. Holland, 1927. Fl. 2.90.

Mauclair, C.—La vie amoureuse de Baudelaire. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1927. 192 pp. Fr. 9.

Mérimée.—Lettres à Viollet-Le Duc, éd. P. Trahard *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xvi + 368 pp.

Michaelsson, K.—Etudes sur les noms de personne fr. d'après les rôles de taille parisiens. Diss. *Upsala*: Lundequista Bokhandeln, 1927. 200 pp.

Michaud Lapeyre, Mme.—Lamartine à Tresserve. *Paris*: Dardel, 1928. 128 pp. Fr. 7.

N...—A. Gide. *Paris*: Edit. du Capitole, 1928. 332 pp. Fr. 50.

Prévost.—Manon Lescaut, éd. M. Allem. *Paris*: Garnier, 1927. Fr. 35.

Roth, G.—Lamartine et la Savoie. *Paris*: Dardel, 1928. viii + 328 pp. Fr. 12.

Schinz, A.—La pensée religieuse de Rousseau et ses récents interprètes *Paris*: Alcan, 1927. 52 pp. [Smith Coll. Studies].

Stendhal.—Journal de mon voyage, éd. L. Royer. *Paris*: Chronique des lettres, 1927. Fr. 125.

Strentz, H.—A. Rimbaud. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. art, 1928. Fr. 6.

Theuriet, A.—Mon oncle Flo, ed. E. A. and L. R. Méras. *Boston*: Heath, 1927. iv + 303 pp. \$1.16.

Thiele, F.—Balzac als Physiognomiker. Diss. Berlin: Ebering, 1927. 54 pp.

Tremblais, G. de la.—La poésie romantique. Paris: Les arts et le livre, 1927. Fr. 12

Valles, C. de.—Beaumarchais magistrat. Paris: Oliven, 1928. Fr. 12.

Villon.—Œuvres, éd. L. Dimier. Paris: Delagrave, 1927. 321 pp.

Vogler, M.—Die schöpferischen Werte der Verlaineschen Lyrik. Zurich: Fussli, 1927. 93 pp. M. 2.80.

Wilson, F. B.—French humor, ed. with ex. and vocab. Boston: Ginn, 1928. v + 140 pp. 80 cts.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Della tirannide, Del Principe e delle lettere, Panegirico di Plinio a Traiano, La virtù sconosciuta; a cura di A. Donati. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 320 pp. L. 25. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 102.)

Alloggio, S.—Saggi non finiti. Roma: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1927. 360 pp. L. 20. (Quaderni di critica letteraria, no. 1.)

Ariosto, Lodovico.—Orlando furioso. Vol. III. Introduzione e note di F. Ermini. Torino: Tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. 467 pp. L. 10. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, vol. 9.)

Borzelli, A.—Storia della vita e delle opere di Giovan Battista Marino. Edizione riveduta. Napoli: Tip. Artigianelli, 1927. 336 pp. L. 30.

Campanella, Tommaso.—Lettere, a cura di V. Spampinato. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 462 pp. L. 40. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 103.)

Carducci, Giosuè.—Prose, 1859-1903. Edizione definitiva. Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1926. 1485 pp. L. 40.

Corso, R.—Reviviscenze. Studi di tradizioni popolari italiane. Serie prima. Catania: Libr. Tirelli di F. Guaitolini, 1927. x + 124 pp. L. 12.

Croce, Benedetto.—Una famiglia di patrioti, ed altri saggi storici e critici. Seconda edizione riveduta. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. viii + 312 pp. L. 25. (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica di B. Croce, XIII.)

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—I miei ricordi. Milano: A. Vallardi, 1927. 429 pp. L. 13. (Gemme per ogni famiglia.)

Dell'Isola, Maria.—Napoléon dans la poésie italienne à partir de 1821. Paris: Gamber, 1928. 378 pp. Fr. 50.

Fabrizi, A.—Contributo alla bibliografia aquilana. Libri: secoli XV-XVIII. Manoscritti: secoli XVII-XIX. (Libri stampati

in Aquila, manoscritti aquilani) *Aquila*: Tip. Vecchioni, 1927. 27 pp

Filangieri Di Candida, R.—Il tempio di Giovanni Pontano in Napoli. Napoli: Accademia Pontaniana, 1926. 41 pp.

Finzi, Paolo Vita.—Antologia apocrifa. A cura di —. Roma: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. 179 pp.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Commedie, a cura di P. Nardi, con uno studio introduttivo e note. Vol. III: Le donne curiose; Sior Todero brontolon, o sia Il vecchio fastidioso; Il ventaglio. Milano: Unitas, 1926. 209 pp. L. 8.50.

Gucciardini, Francesco.—Lettere inedite di — a Bartolomeo Lanfredini, dalla fine dell'assedio di Firenze al secondo convegno di Clemente VII e di Carlo V (28 giugno 1530-2 dicembre 1532). Thèse complémentaire pour le doctorat ès lettres présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, par A. Ojetea. *Aquila*: Vecchioni, 1926. xxxv + 239 pp.

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Canti. Edizione critica ad opera di F. Moroncini. Discorso, corredo critico di materia in gran parte inedita con riproduzione d'autografi. Bologna-Rocca San Casciano: L. Cappelli, 1927. 2 vols., lxxxvii + 378, 379-714 pp. L. 80.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Storie fiorentine. Testo critico con introduzione e note per cura di P. Carli. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1927. 2 vols., xci + 234, 304 pp. L. 100.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII. Firenze: A. Salani, 1927. 447 pp. L. 4.

— I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII. Introduzione e note di E. Bellorini. Vol. I e II. Torino: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. 2 vols., xlv + 287, 346 pp. L. 20. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 40-41.)

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Epistolario. Vol. XXIV. Imola: P. Galeati, 1926. vi + 353 pp. (Edizione nazionale degli scritti di Giuseppe Mazzini. Scritti editi e inediti, XLV.)

Meano, C.—Confessioni d'un giovane scrittore: girotondo di corsa. Torino: G. Del Signore, 1927. 62 pp. L. 6.

Miniati, P.—F. D. Guerrazzi. Roma: Fondazione "Leonardo" per la cultura italiana, 1927. 335 pp. L. 15. (Guide bibliografiche, ni. 28-29-30.)

Mormino, G.—Alfredo Panzini. Roma: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1927. 35 pp. L. 4.

Paladino, G.—Opuscoli e lettere di riformatori italiani del Cinquecento, a cura di —. Vol. II. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 290 pp. L. 25. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 99.)

Pellico, Silvio.—Le mie prigioni; aggiuntivi i capitoli inediti *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1927. 102 pp. L. 2.

—Le mie prigioni; con introduzione e commento di M. L. Gentile. *Napoli*: F. Perrella, 1926. vi + 168 pp. L. 7.50. (Biblioteca classica italiana.)

Pellizzaro, G. B.—La vita e le opere di Carlo Goldoni. Seconda edizione riveduta. *Livorno*: Giusti, 1926. viii + 90 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca degli studenti, vol. 275-275 bis.)

Porta, Carlo.—Poesie edite ed inedite, a cura di A. Ottoloni e con un proemio di M. Scherillo. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1927. lxxvi + 358 pp. L. 16. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.)

Sailer, Luigi.—L'arpa della fanciullezza. Antologia di poesia, a cura di — Nuova edizione interamente rivista ad uso dell'infanzia e della gioventù da G. Fanciulli. *Milano*: G. Agnelli, 1927. 382 pp. L. 12.80.

Savonarola, Gerolamo.—Poesie. Introduzione e note di V. Piccoli. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. xxiii + 142 pp. L. 6. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, serie II, vol. 53.)

Toschi, P.—L'antico dramma sacro italiano. Scelta e prefazione di —. Vol. I e II. *Firenze*: Libr. edit. Fiorentina, 1925-27. 2 vols., lxxii + 1-314, 315-717 pp. L. 20 (I libri della fede, ni. 23-24.)

Venditti, M.—Ombre, volti, poesie, fantasie. *Napoli*: A. Morano, 1927. 170 pp. L. 9.

Veio, E.—I poeti romaneschi. Notizie, saggi, bibliografia. *Roma*: Anon. Romana, 1927. 287 pp. L. 25.

Zottoli, Angelandrea.—Leopardi: storia di un'anima. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 338 pp. L. 22. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 147.)

PORTUGUESE

Ayres de Magalhães Sepúlveda, C.—Diccionario Bibliográfico da Guerra Peninsular, contendo a indicação de obras impressas e manuscritas, em português, espanhol, catalão, francês, inglês, italiano, alemão, latim etc. Vol. II. *Coimbra*: Imp. da Universidade, 1926. 427 pp.

Barreto, M.—A través do Dicionário e da Gramática. *Rio de Janeiro*: Oficina Industrial Gráfica, 1927. 412 pp.

Escritos de El Rei D. Pedro V.—Coligidos e publicados pela Academia das Sciencias de Lisboa. 4 vols. *Coimbra*: Imp. da Universidade, 1923, 1924, 1926, 1927. xlv + 355, 289, 368, 260 pp.

Figueiredo, F. de.—Características de la Literatura portuguesa. Trad. de R. M.

Tenreiro. Segunda ed. *Buenos Aires*: "Virtus," 1926. 72 pp.

—Historia da Literatura portuguesa. Trad. del Marqués de Lozoya. *Barcelona*: Editorial Labor, 1927. 391 + xvi, ilustraciones. (Colección Labor. Sección III. Ciencias literarias, núm. 123-124.)

Lamas Carvajal, V.—Espíñas, follas e frores. *Orense*: "La Región," 1927. 198 + 133 pp. 5 ptas.

—Sandades gallegas. Gallegadas. Cartas os gallegos. *Orense*: "La Región," 1927. 91 + 115 + 24 pp. 5 ptas.

Lima, B. de.—Gomes de Amorin, vida e obras do ilustre biografo de Garrett. *Pavoa de Varzim*: Tip. da Sociedade Gráfica Povoense, 1927. 64 pp.

Lugris Freire, M.—Gramática do idioma gallego. *A Oruña*: Zincke Hnos., 1922. viii + 158 pp.

Silva Correia, J. da.—A linguagem da mulher em relação à do homem. *Lisboa*: Oficina Tipográfica da Escola Normal Primária, 1927. 52 pp.

Walter, F.—La Littérature portugaise en Angleterre à l'époque romantique. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. viii + 150 pp.

SPANISH

Bustamante y Urrutia, J. M. de.—Catálogos de la Biblioteca "América," I: Catálogo alfabético de autores de obras de más de 200 pp. [*Santiago de Galicia*]: Tip. "El Eco de Santiago," 1927. xi + 204 pp. (Anales de la Universidad de Santiago.)

Coester, A.—The Literary History of Spanish America. Second edition. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. 522 pp.

Depta, M. V.—Lope de Vega. *Breslau*: Ostdeutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1927. iv + 343 pp.

Díez Carbonell, P.—Cancionero de Madrid. *Madrid*: Tip. Artística, 1927. 150 pp.

Escar Ladaga, M.—Apuntes biográficos de varios impresores españoles contemporáneos de Ibarra. *Zaragoza*: La Académica, 1927. 23 pp.

Furt, J. M.—L'influsso della letteratura italiana sulla letteratura argentina: Angel de Estrada. *Roma*: Fratelli Treves, 1926. 31 pp. (Publicazioni dell'Istituto Cristoforo Colombo, núm. 26.)

García Arista y Rivera, G.—Fruta de Aragón. Tomo III. Abatollada. Cuentos, episodios, cuadros aragoneses. *Madrid*: Calpe, 1927. 244 pp. 5 ptas. (Colección Argensola.)

García y Barbarin, E.—Mosaico de fábulas escogidas. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. 160 pp.

Giannini, A.—España vista al través de sus escritores. Antología de prosistas y poetas españoles desde los orígenes hasta nuestros días. *Florence*: Sansoni [1927]. vii + 440 pp.

Gómez de Orozco, F.—Catálogo de la colección de manuscritos de J. García Icazbalceta relativos a la Historia de América. *México*: Imp. de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1927. xv + 287 pp.

Góngora.—Romances. Ed. por J. M. de Cossío. *Madrid*: "Revista de Occidente," 1927. 252 pp. 5 ptas

Gracián.—Oracolo manuale e arte della prudenza. Trad. e commento di E. Mele. *Bari*. Gius. Laterza & Figli, 1927. 244 pp.

Lenz, R.—Problemas del Diccionario castellano en América. *Buenos-Aires*: Imp. de la Universidad, 1926. 47 pp.

León, R.—La voz de la sangre. Ensayos españoles. Prólogo de A. Maura. Tercera edición. *Madrid*. Suc. de Rivadeneyra, 1927. 323 pp. (Obras completas, XI.)

—Los trabajadores de la muerte. *Madrid*. Hernando, 1927. 406 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras Completas, XVI.)

Marroquín y Aguirre, P.—Bécquer, el poeta del amor y del dolor. *Madrid*: Pueyo, 1927. 38 pp.

Núñez Regueiro, M.—Del verbo lírico. *Buenos Aires*: Porter Hnos., 1927. 185 pp.

Pedro de Alcántara, San.—Tratado de la oración. *Salamanca*: Tip. de Calatrava, 1926. 107 pp.

Pérez Galdós, B.—Casandra. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. 160 pp. 2.50 ptas.

Poetas líricos románticos.—Dos vols. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1926 (?). 94 pp. y 111 pp. + 7 hojas. 1.75 cada vol. (Letras Españolas, XVI y XVII.)

Puccini, M.—Vincenzo Blasco Ibáñez *Roma*: A. F. Formiggin, 1926. 64 pp.

Ray, M. L., and Bahret, R. A.—Lecciones elementales. *Boston*: Allyn and Bacon, 1927. xv + 357 pp. \$1.40.

Rey, A.—Índice de nombres propios y de asuntos importantes de las Cantigas de Santa María. *Madrid*: Tip. de la R. de A. B. y M., 1927. 36 pp.

Reyes, A.—Cuestiones Gongorinas. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 268 pp. 5 ptas.

Rodríguez Marín, F.—La *Fúrida* de Gálvez de Montalvo. *Madrid*: Tip. de la Rev. de Arch. Bibl. y Museos, 1927. 81 pp. (Curso de entrada en la Academia de la Historia.)

Romances históricos.—Auswahl von alten Romanzen zur Geschichte Spaniens (bis 1492). Herausgegeben von A. Günther. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1926. 34 pp.

Saavedra y Fajardo, D. y Fernández Navarrete, P.—Obras. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1926. xxi + 560 pp. 12 ptas. B. A. E., XXV.)

Salaverría, J. M.—Instantes. Literatura. Política. Costumbres. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 196 pp. 4 ptas.

Sánchez Alonso, B.—Fuentes de la Historia Española e Hispano Americana. *Madrid*: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1927. Vol. I, xvi + 633 pp. Vol. II, 468 pp. (Publicaciones de la R. F. E., VIII.)

Sangroniz, J. A.—La expansión cultural de España en el extranjero, y principalmente en Hispano-América. *Madrid-Ceuta*: Ed. "Hércules," 1925. 301 pp.

Sarrailh, J.—Prosateurs espagnols contemporains. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1927. 234 pp.

Switzer, R.—The Ciceronian Style in Fr. Luis de Granada. *New York*: Instituto de las Españas, 1927. vi + 159 pp. \$1.90.

Torrendell, J.—Los concursos literarios y otros ensayos críticos. *Buenos Aires*: Tor, 1926. 78 pp. 1 peso.

Valera, D. de.—Crónica de los Reyes Católicos, de Mosén. . . Ed. y estudio por J. M. de Carriazo. *Madrid*: R. F. E., 1927. cliv + 314 pp. 16 ptas. (Anejos de la R. F. E., VIII.)

Valle Inclán, R.—Retablo de la avaricia, la lujuria y la muerte. [Piezas dramáticas: Ligazón. La rosa de papel. El embrujado. La cabeza del Bautista. Sacrilegio.] *Madrid*: Suc. de Rivadeneyra, 1927. 340 pp. (Opera omnia, IV.)

Van Praag, J. A.—Enkele opmerkingen over Pío Baroja, zijn leven en zijn werk. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1927. 46 pp.

Valverde, A. L.—Juan Clemente Zenea; su proceso de 1871. *Habana*: Imp. "El Siglo XX," 1927. 263 pp. S. p.

Villalaz, N.—La Real Academia Española y sus advertencias [al Diccionario]. *Paris*: Ed. Paris-América [1926?] 179 pp.

Villa-Urrutia, Marqués de.—Mujeres de antaño. Teresa Cabarrús. (Madame Tallien.) Con tres retratos. *Madrid*: Beltrán, 1927. 113 pp. 7 ptas.

GENERAL

Falk, Hjalmar.—Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk 30. desember 1927 fra elever, venner og kolleger. *Oslo*: H. Aschehoug & Co., 1927. 476 pp.

Spitzer, L.—Stilstudien. Bd. I u. II. *Munich*: Hueber, 1927. M. 14.

Robertson, D. A.—American Universities and Colleges. *New York*: Scribner's, 1928. xii + 884 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Allen, Hope Emily.—Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle. (M. L. A. Monograph Series). *New York*: D. C. Heath, and *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. xvi + 568. \$7.50.

Baldwin, Charles Sears.—Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. Pp. 321. \$2.50.

Darbishire, Helen (ed.).—Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, I, II, and Parts of V and XII. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 63. \$.50. [Based on De Sélincourt's edition; excellent though very brief introduction and notes.]

English Association, The.—Essays and Studies, Vol. XIII. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 144. \$2.50.

Frison, W. C.—L'Influence du Naturalisme Français sur les Romanciers Anglais de 1885 à 1900. *Paris*: Marcel Guard, 1925. Pp. 293.

Gee, J. A.—The Life and Works of Thomas Lupset. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. xvi + 357. \$5.00.

Hoffman, Alexis.—Liturgical Dictionary. *Collegeville, Minn.*: The Liturgical Press, 1928. Pp. 187.

Jebb, E. M. (ed.).—Sheridan's School for Scandal. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 112. \$ 50. [I. Williams's text, with 3 corrections, 20 pages of notes, and a valuable appendix of Sheridan's early sketches for the play.]

Lucas, F. S.—Tragedy (Hogarth Lectures, No. 2). *New York*: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928. Pp. 160. \$1.25.

Miles, Hamish (ed.).—The Man of Feeling by Henry Mackenzie. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. 208. 7 sh. 6 d.

Oliphant, E. H. C.—The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. xv + 553. \$5.00.

Partridge, Eric (ed.).—Ixion in Heaven and Endymion, Disraeli's Skit and Aytoun's Burlesque. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1927. Pp. ix + 75.

Rollins, H. E. (ed.).—Tottel's Miscellany, Vol. I. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xix + 345. \$5.00.

Thorndike, Ashley.—Shakespeare in America. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. 22. \$.45.

Vechtman-Veth, A. C. E.—A Syntax of Living English. *Utrecht*: Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Pp. 326.

GERMAN

Angstmann, Else.—Der Henker in der Volksmeinung. Seine Namen und sein Vorkommen in der mündlichen Volkstüberlieferung [Teutonista, Beiheft 1] *Bonn*: F. Klopp, 1928. xi, 113 pp. M. 11.

Beriger, Leonhard.—Gillparzers Persönlichkeit in seinem Werk. [Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 3.] *Horgen bei Zurich*: Münster-Presse, 1928. 128 pp. M. 6.40.

Diesch, Carl.—Bibliographie der germanistischen Zeitschriften [Bibliographical Publications. Germanic Section, MLA., Vol. 1.] *Leipzig*: Hiersemann, 1927. xv, 441 pp. 4°. M. 60.

Frömbgen, Hanns.—E. M. Arndt und die deutsche Romantik. Diss. *Münster*. 1926. 96 pp.

Gaedick, Walter.—Der weise Narr in der englischen Literatur von Erasmus bis Shakespeare. *Leipzig*: Mayer und Müller, 1928. III, 55 pp. M. 3.50.

Havenstein, Martin.—Thomas Mann. Der Dichter und Schriftsteller. *Berlin*: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1927. xi, 357 pp. M. 14.

Herzog, Werner.—Mystik und Lyrik bei Novalis. Diss. *Jenna*. *Stuttgart*: Orient-Occident-Verlag, 1928. 51 pp. M. 1.

Jahresberichte über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie (Jg. 47 =) N. F. Bd. 5. Bibliographie 1925. *Berlin*: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1928. xx, 283 pp. M. 19.

Jellinghaus, H.—Mittelniederdeutsche geistliche Lieder und Sprüche. Ausgewählt. *Osnabrück*: F. Schöningh, 1928. 63 pp. M. 1.20.

Jungandreas, Wolfgang.—Beiträge zur Erforschung der Besiedlung Schlesiens und zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der schlesischen Mundart. [Wort und Brauch H. 17] *Breslau*: Marcus, 1928. xiv, 398 pp. M. 20.

Korn, Adolf.—Das rhetorische Element in den Predigten Taulers. Diss. *Münster*: 1927. 40 pp.

Kriessbach, Erich.—Die Trauerspiele in Gottscheds "Deutscher Schaubühne" und ihr Verhältnis zur Dramaturgie und zum Theater ihrer Zeit [Hermæa Nr. 19]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. 184 pp. M. 8.

Laserstein, Käte.—Wolframs von Eschenbach germanische Sendung. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung des Dichters in seiner Zeit. [Germ. Studien, H. 56]. *Ebering*: 1928. 115 pp. M. 4.80.

O'Sullivan-Köhling, Ilse.—Shelley und die bildende Kunst. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. viii, 230 pp. M. 8.

Porterfield, Allen W.—Modern German Stories, edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary. *New York*: Heath & Co. 1928. xxxvii, 408 pp. \$2.00.

Rabbinowitsch, Jacob Faiwusch.—Probleme der Neidhartforschung. Eine Untersuchung über das Verhältnis zwischen Neidhartliedern und Pseudo-Neidhartten. [Academisch Proefschrift, Amsterdam]. *Bussum*: C. A. J. Van Dishoek, 1928. 253 pp.

Rilke, Rainer Maria.—Briefe an August Rodin. *Leipzig*: Insel Verlag, 1928. 88 pp. M. 20.

Rosenstock, Paula.—Das "Märchen" von Goethe. Eine Weissagung, gedeutet. *Freiburg i. B.*: Gebr. Gunther, 1928. 27 pp. M. 1.

Schlessing, A.—Deutscher Wortschatz. Ein Hilfs- u. Nachschlagebuch. Mit e. ausführl. Wort- u. Sachverz. 6. Aufl., nach d. Grundsätzen der vorigen weiter verb. u. verm. v. H. Wehrle. *Stuttgart*: C. Gruninger [1927]. xxviii, 537 pp. M. 10.

Schmidt, Friedr.—Goethe und seine Ahnen in der Kyffhäuserlandschaft. Mit 4. Abb. *Sangerhausen*: 1927. 84 pp. M. 3.

Sommer, Paul.—Erläuterungen zu Heinrich von Kleists "Penthesilea." [Königs Erlaut. z. d. Klassikern, 212]. *Leipzig*: H. Beyer [1928]. 62 pp. 60Pf.

Spiero, Heir.—Gustav Falke. Ein Lebensbild. Mit 2 Bildtafeln. *Braunschweig*: Westermann [1928]. 100 pp. M. 4.

Straumann, Heir.—Justinus Kerner und der Okkultismus in der deutschen Romantik. [Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 4]. *Horgen b. Zurich*: Münster-Presse, 1928. 144 pp. M. 6.50.

Styra, Ambros.—Franziskus von Assisi in der neueren deutschen Literatur. *Breslau*: O. Borgmeyer [1928]. vii, 182 pp. M. 7.50.

Thalmann, Marianne.—Henrik Ibsen, ein Erlebnis der Deutschen. [Beitr. z. deu. Literaturwiss. Nr. 29]. *Marburg a. L.*: Elwert, 1928. iv, 67 pp. M. 2.50

Urstadt, Karoline.—Der Kraftmeier im deutschen Drama von Gryphius bis zum Sturm und Drang. Diss. *Giessen*: 1926. 56 pp.

Vogt, Walther H.—Stilgeschichte der Eddischen Wissensdichtung. 1. Bd.: Der Kultredner (Pulr). [Veröffentl. d. Schleswig-Holst. Univ.-Ges. Nr. 6, 1=Schriften der Baltischen Komm. zu Kiel, Bd. IV, 1.1]. *Breslau*: Ferd. Hirt, 1927. 170 pp. M. 12.60.

Wedel, Max.—Herders Eintritt in die deutsche Literaturkritik. Diss. *Berlin*: 1927. 66 pp.

—Herder als Kritiker. [Germ. Studien, H. 55]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1928. vi, 143 pp. M. 6.

Weller, Elisabeth.—Richard Wagner und der völkische Gedanke. Diss. *Tübingen*: 1927. 61 pp.

FRENCH

Aykroyd, P.—Louis Le Cardonnell. *London*: Dent, 1927. 190 pp.

Bale, K.—La Provence à travers l'œuvre d'A. Daudet. *Aix-en-Provence*: Impr. Univ., 1927. 121 pp.

Bartsch, K.—Chrestomathie de l'anc. fr. revue p. L. Wiese. *Leipzig*: Vogel, 1927. xii + 546 pp. M. 17.

Batifol, L.—Le Cardinal de Retz. *Paris*: Hachette, 1927. 241 pp.

Bertrand, L.—Idées et portraits (Bourget, Curot, Adam, Régnier). *Paris*: Plon, 1927. xlvii + 207 pp. Fr. 12.

—Œuvres poétiques, éd. C. Sprietsma. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xvi + 136 pp.

Borlé, E.—Conjonctions de subordination dans la langue du 16e s. *Paris*: Belles lettres, 1928. Fr. 30

Carcassonne, E.—Montesquieu et le problème de la constitution fr. au xviii s. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1927. xvi + 736 pp.

Castellane.—Lettres de Chateaubriand à la comtesse de Castellane. *Paris*: Plon, 1927. 204 pp. Fr. 10.

Davis et Simonson.—Bibliographie des œuvres de P. Valéry. *Paris*: Plaisir de Bibliophile, 1926. 43 pp.

Daudet.—Contes alsaciens et provençaux, ed. R. Scott. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1928. viii + 104 pp. 50 cts.

Duclaux, M.—Portrait of Pascal. *London*: Benn, 1927. 10 sh. 6 d.

Garnier, A.—A. d'Aubigné et le parti protestant. 3 vols. *Paris*: Fischbacher, 1925. Fr 120.

Gill-mark, Grace.—Anne-Marie du Bocage. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 182 pp. (Bib. de la R. L. C.)

Godet, P.—Mme de Charrière et ses amis. *Paris*: Attinger, 1927. x + 495 pp.

Hazard, P.—La vie de Stendhal. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. fr., 1927. Fr. 12.

Henriot, E.—Voltaire et Frédéric II. *Paris*: Hachette, 1927. Fr. 6.

Hopfgarten, G.—Der Untergang altfranz. Wörter germanischer Herkunft. Diss. *Halle*: 1926.

Johnstone, G. H.—Prosper Mérimée. *London*: Routledge, 1927. 10 sh. 6 d.

Jones, P. M.—E. Verhaeren. *London*: Milford, 1927. xx + 246 pp. 4 sh. 6 d.

Jouanne, P.—L'harmonie lamartinienne. *Paris*: Jouve, 1926. xix + 420 pp.

Kallós, E.—Bilder aus der neuesten franz. Lit. *Cernautz*: 1926. Lei 30.

Klemperer, V.—Die moderne franz. Prosa. *Leipzig*: Teubner, 1926. iv + 386 pp. M. 6.

Ley, H.—G. de Maupassant u. das normannische Bauerntum. Diss. *Cologne*: 1925. 88 pp.

Lipschutz, M.—Montesquieu als Geschichtsphilosoph. Basel diss. *Strasbourg*: Impr. eds. univ., 1927. 70 pp.

Luschka, W. H.—Die Rolle des Fortschrittsgedankens in der Poetik u. lit. Kritik der Franzosen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Diss. *Munich*: 1927. 126 pp.

Maes, P.—G. Rodenbach. *Paris*: Figuière, 1926. Fr. 12.

Magne, E.—Le cœur et l'esprit de Mme de Lafayette. *Paris*: Emile-Paul, 1927. 403 pp. Fr. 13 50.

Noo, H. de.—Sebillet et son art poétique rapproché de La Deffence et Ill. de Du Bellay. Amsterdam diss. *Utrecht*: Beyers, 1927.

Normandy, G.—Maupassant intime. *Paris*: Michel, 1926. 248 pp. Fr. 18.

Palache, J. G.—Four novelists of the Old Régime (Crébillon, Laclos, Diderot, Restif de la B.). *London*: Cape, 1927. 12 sh 6d.

Peletier du Mans.—L'Amour des amours, ed. A. Van Bever. *Paris*: Soc. des médecins bibliophiles, 1926. xviii + 159 pp.

Redenbacher, F.—Die Novellistik der franz. Hochrenaissance. Diss. *Munich*: 1927. 72 pp.

Rimbaud, A.—Lettres et écrits inédits, éd. G. Izambard. *Paris*: Kra, 1927. 357 pp.

Ritter, E.—La famille et la jeunesse de Rousseau. *Geneva*: Jullien, 1927. 372 pp.

Sainte-Beuve.—Volupté, éd. M. Poux. 2 vols. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1927. Fr. 40.

Scève, M.—Œuvres poétiques complètes, éd. B. Guegan. *Paris*: Garnier, 1927. Fr. 9.

Schendel, A. van.—Verlaine. *Amsterdam*: Meulenhoff, 1927. 3 fl. 90 c.

Siège de Barbastre, le, éd. J.-L. Perrier. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. viii + 279 pp. Fr. 15. (Classiques fr. du m. a.)

Tharaud, J. et J.—Mes années chez Barrès. *Paris*: Plon, 1928. 308 pp. Fr. 12.

Van Daele, H.—Phonétique du fr. mod. *Paris*: Colin, 1927. Fr. 6.50.

Van de Panne.—Recherches sur les rapports entre le Romantisme fr. et le théâtre hollandais. Groningen diss. *Amsterdam*: Paris, 1927.

Weiss, R.—La Maison de V. Hugo à Guernesey. *Paris*: Ville de Paris, 1928. Fr. 200.

Zech, P.—J.-A. Rimbaud. *Leipzig*: Volkswanderer-Verlag, 1927. M. 2.50.

Zweig, S.—Erinnerungen an E. Verhaeren. *Salzburg*: Selbstverlag, 1927. 90 pp. M. 12.

ITALIAN

Abbiati, T. M.—Novelle a spunto Manzoni di un discepolo del Parini, professore di A. Manzoni (Cosimo Galeazzo Scotti). *Milano*: Casa edit. "Amatrix," 1927. 333 pp. L. 16.50.

Alighieri, Dante.—La Vita nuova: riscontrata su le migliori edizioni, con introduzione e note di G. R. Ceriello. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 74 pp. L. 1. (Biblioteca di letteratura, no. 7.)

Arici, C.—Un avventuriero della critica (G. Baretti). *Palermo*: Casa edit. "La Luce," 1926. 140 pp.

Baffo, G.—Le poesie. *Catania*: G. Guaitolimi, 1927. 132 pp. L. 30.

Berchet, Giovanni.—Poesie scelte, originali e tradotte, con introduzione e note a cura di N. Caccia. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 127 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 55-56.)

Bonghi, R.—I fatti miei e i miei pensieri. Pagine del diario con introduzione e note di F. Piccolo. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1927. 201 pp. L. 12.

Bulferetti, D.—Alessandro Manzoni: storia e filosofia con saggi di opere inedite. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1927. 114 pp. L. 5 25. (Scrittori italiani con notizie storiche e analisi estetiche.)

Cappuccio, C.—La vita e le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1926. 103 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca degli studenti, ni. 671-672.)

Cardelli, F.—Alfredo Oriani nel terzo annuale della "Marcia al Cardello." Conferenza tenuta al circolo di cultura di Bologna il giorno 28 aprile, 1927. *Bologna*: Coop. tip. Azzoguidi, 1927. 28 pp.

Cavallotti, Felice.—Il cantico dei cantici: scherzo poetico in un atto. I pezzenti: dramma storico in sei atti. *Sesto S. Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1927. 190 pp. L. 2.

Chiabrera, Gabriello.—Poesie scelte; con prefazione a cura di G. A. Venturi. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 111 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 46-47.)

D'Annunzio, Gabriele.—Teatro D'Annunziano. La Figlia di Jorio, Francesca da Rimini, La gloria, La fiaccola sotto il moggio; 11 settembre 1927-aprile 1928, a cura di C. Lari. *Milano*: Libr. edit. Milanese, 1927. 145 pp. L. 7. (Terrigni, M., D'Annunzio e il suo teatro; Paolieri, F., La poesia nel teatro D'Annunziano; Corsi, M., Come fu preparata l'impresa; Zaccaroni, E., Lettera; D'Annunzio, G., Due lettere; Michelotti, G., Le ragioni di un insuccesso; Adami, G., "La figlia di Jorio" e la musica.)

Foscolo, Ugo.—Poesie. *Firenze*: "Rinascimento del libro," 1927. xv + 122 pp.

Gioberti, Vincenzo.—Epistolario. Edizione nazionale a cura di G. Gentile e G. Balsamo-Crivelli. Vol. I e II. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1927. 2 vols., xvi + 311, 375 pp. L. 30.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il burbero benefico: commedia in tre atti, con prefazione e note di A. Avancini. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1927. 122 pp. L. 2.75. (Collana di coltura classica.)

Janni, E.—Machiavelli. *Milano*: L. F. Cogliati, 1927. 310 pp. L. 16.

Levi, A.—Dizionario etimologico del dialetto piemontese. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1927. xix + 301 pp. L. 26.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe: introduzione e note di C. Guerrieri Crocetti. Seconda edizione. *Venezia*: "La nuova Italia," 1927. 194 pp. L. 6. (Scrittori italiani.)

—La Mandragola; La Clizia; Belfagor, a cura di V. Osimo. Terza edizione. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. xx + 144 pp. (Classici del ridere, no. 10.)

Mangini, A.—Il teatro drammatico italiano, 1850-1927. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1927. 108 pp. L. 4.50. (Biblioteca degli studenti, vol. 677-79.)

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Poesie giovanili, inni sacri, canzoni ed odi politiche, tragedie, col commento di A. Gustarelli. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1927. 241 pp. L. 8.

Marziano, Giovanna.—Gli elementi romantici negli inni sacri di Alessandro Manzoni. *Caltanissetta*: Tip. "Ospizio di beneficenza," 1927. 32 pp.

Mestica, G.—San Francesco, Dante e Giotto. *Macerata*: Bisson e Leopardi, 1927. 168 pp. L. 10.

Monti, Vincenzo.—Canti e poemi scelti; con introduzione e note a cura di G. Neppi. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 122 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 48-49.)

Palmieri, E.—Interpretazioni del mio tempo. I: Giovanni Papini. Bibliografia 1902-1927 a cura di T. Casini. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1927. 310 pp. L. 14.

Poliziano, Angelo.—Rispetti, ballate e rime varie, con introduzione e glossario a cura di E. Rho. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 143 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 51-52.)

Tasso, Torquato.—Aminta: favola boscareccia, con prefazione di G. Lipparini. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 97 pp. L. 1. (Biblioteca di letteratura, no. 27.)

Zanazzo, G. B.—Appunti critici di folklore veneto. Un programma didattico della scuola complementare pareggiata "Giusto

SPANISH

Artigas, M.—Menéndez y Pelayo. *Madrid*: Ed. Voluntad, y *Santander*: Aldus, S. A., 1927. 310 pp.

Bertrand, L.—Santa Teresa. Trad. por E. Dugi. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1927. 343 pp. 6 ptas.

Calzada, R.—Cincuenta años de América. Notas autobiográficas. Vol. II. *Buenos Aires*: Pereira e Hijos, 1927. 500 pp. (Obras Completas, V.)

Camba, J.—La rana viajera. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by F. de Onís. *Boston*: Heath and Co., 1928. xviii + 258 pp. \$1.12.

Donoso, A.—Sarmiento en el destierro. Ed. ordenada con notas y un estudio. *Buenos Aires*: Gleizer, 1927.

Furt, J. M.—Coreografía gauchesca. Apuntes para su estudio. *Buenos Aires*: Imp. Com. Hnos. 79 pp. 2.50 pesos.

Hatzfeld, H.—"Don Quijote" als Wortkunstwerk. Die einzelnen Stilmittel und ihr Sinn. *Leipzig-Berlin*: Teubner, 1927. 292 pp. (Teubners Spanische und Hispano-Amerikanische Studienbücherei.)

Imbert, L., and Piñol, F.—Fundamentals of Spanish. *New York*: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1928. xviii + 278 + v pp.

Lista, A.—Poesías inéditas. Ed. y estudio preliminar de J. M. de Cossío. *Madrid*: "Voluntad," 1927. 423 pp. Sociedad de Menéndez y Pelayo.)

Memoria correspondiente a los cursos 1924-5 y 1925-6. *Madrid*: Junta para ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas, 1927. xvi + 480 pp.

Oteyza, L. de.—De España al Japón. Itinerario impresionista. *Madrid*: Pueyo, 1927. 292 pp. 5 ptas.

Pérez, S.—Somos . . . (Críticas y cuentos históricos). *Montevideo*: Imp. La Unión, 1927. 115 pp. 4 ptas.

Rubio, D.—El lenguaje popular mexicano. *México*: "La Lucha," 1927. 35 pp. (Discurso leído ante la Academia Mexicana, correspondiente de la Real Española.)

Sanguily, M.—Oradores de Cuba. *Havana*: A. Dorrbecker, 1926. 281 pp. + 1 hoja.

Tamayo y Rubio, J.—Cartas marruecas del coronel D. Joseph Cadahalso. Estudio crítico. *Granada*: Lib. Guevara, 1927. 80 pp.

Vaeth, J. A.—Applied Spanish Grammar. *New York*: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928. xi + 275 pp. \$1.60.

Whitman, I. L.—Longfellow and Spain.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Bailey, Margery (ed.).—The Hypochondriack by James Boswell. Stanford University Press, 1928. 2 vols. Pp. 316, 340. \$15.

Banks, Theodore Howard.—The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. xi + 356. \$5 00.

Beatty, Arthur (ed.).—Romantic Poetry of the Early Nineteenth Century (Modern Student's Library). *New York*: Scribner's, 1928. Pp. xxv + 546.

Blakeney, E. H. (ed.).—Horace on The Art of Poetry. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. 135.

Boas, F. S. and Hereford, C. H.—The Year's Work in English Studies, Vol. VII, 1926. (Edited for the English Ass.) *Oxford*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 321. \$2.50.

Brooke, Stafford A.—On Ten Plays of Shakespeare. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. \$2.50.

— Ten More Plays of Shakespeare. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. \$2.50.

Bundy, M. W.—The Theory of Imagination in Classical and Medieval Thought (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XII). *Urbana, Ill.*: University of Illinois Press, 1927. Pp. 289. \$3.00.

Cooper, Lane, and Gudeman, Alfred.—A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle. (Cornell Studies in English) *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. 179. \$2.00.

Das, Praphulla Kumar.—Evidences of a Growing Taste for Nature in the Age of Pope. *Calcutta*: Calcutta University Press, 1928. Pp. 64.

Davis, John.—The Post-Captain or the Wooden Walls Well Manned. Ed. R. H. Case. *London*: The Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. 247. 7 sh. 6 d.

De Vane, William Clyde, Jr.—Browning's Parleyings, the Autobiography of a Mind. *New Haven*: Yale University Press, 1927. Pp. 306. \$4.00.

Dobrée, Bonamy (ed.).—Five Restoration Tragedies (World's Classics). *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. xviii + 450. \$.80. [All for Love, Venice Preserv'd, Oronoko, The Fair Penitent, Cato.]

Fairchild, Hoxie Neale.—The Noble Savage, a study in Romantic Naturalism. *New York*: Columbia University Press, 1928. Pp. xii + 535. \$5.00.

Hillhouse, James T.—The Grub-Street Journal. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke University Press, 1928. Pp. vii + 354. \$3.00.

Kruisinga, E.—English Grammar for Dutch Students, Vol. 1. (Fourth edition). *Utrecht*: Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Pp. 230.

Lucas, F. L.—The Complete Works of John Webster. *Boston and New York*: Houghton Mifflin, 1928. 4 vols. \$25.00.

Mackenzie, W. Roy.—Ballads and Sea-Songs from Nova Scotia. *Cambridge*: Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xxxvii + 421. \$5.00.

Mahling, Carl.—Über Tonvokal + ht im Frühmittelenglischen. *Weimar*: G. Utschmann. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1928. Pp. viii + 200.

Mawer, A. and Stenton, F. M.—The Place Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire (English Place-Name Society, vol. iii). *Cambridge*: University Press, 1926. Pp. xlii + 316. 18 sh.

Mawer, A. and Stenton, F. M. in collaboration with F. T. S. Houghton.—The Place-Names of Worcestershire. (English Place-Name Society, vol. iv.) *Cambridge*: University Press, 1927. Pp. xlv + 420. 20 sh.

McKerrow, R. B.—An Introduction to Bibliography. *Oxford*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. xvi + 359. \$6.00.

Nicolson, Harold.—The Development of English Biography (Hogarth Lectures, No. 4). *New York*: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928. Pp. 158. \$1.25.

Nicoll, Allardyce.—Studies in Shakespeare (Hogarth Lectures, No. 3). *New York*: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928. Pp. 168. \$1.25.

Notcutt, H. C. (ed.).—Endymion, by John Keats. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. lxi + 242.

Pierce, F. E., and Schreiber, C. F.—Fiction and Fantasy of German Romance (Selections from the German Romantic Authors, 1790-1830, in English Translation). *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. viii + 392. \$2.00.

Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur.—A Lecture on Lectures (Hogarth Lectures, No. 1). *New York*: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928. Pp. 60. \$1.00.

Sutherland, J. R. (ed.).—Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday. *New York*: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 95. \$.50. [A school edition with introduction, notes, and glossary of unfamiliar words.]

Tannenbaum, Samuel A.—The Assassination of Christopher Marlowe (A New View). Privately printed. *New York*: The Tenny Press. Pp. 67.

Tucker, Lena Lucile and Benham, Allen Rogers.—A Bibliography of Fifteenth Century Literature. *Seattle*: University of Washington Press, 1928. Pp. 162.

Ward, B. M.—The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford, 1550-1604. *London*: John Murray, 1928. Pp. 408 + xv. 21 sh.

Wild, Dr. B. Josef.—Dryden und die römische Kirche. *Leipzig*: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske, 1928. Pp. ix + 91.

Willmott, R. A.—A Journal of Summer Time in the Country. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. 235. 7 sh. 6 d.

GERMAN

Allason, Barbara.—Bettina Brentano: studio sul romanticismo tedesco. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 216 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 149.)

Gerhard, Wilhelm (ed.).—Historien der alten B. [Bibl. d. Literar. Vereins in Stuttgart. Publ. 271 = Jahresgabe f. 1926-1927.] *Leipzig*: Hirsemann, 1927. lxxix, 189 pp. M. 20.

Glock, Wilhelm.—Freigeist und Freigeisterei in den Hauptromanen Jean Pauls. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1927. 71 pp.

Grillparzer, Franz.—Weh dem der lügt! Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Ed. with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Clair Hayden Bell. *New York*: Oxford Press, Am. Branch, 1928. xxi, 201 pp. \$1.15.

Heise, Wilhelm.—August Strindberg. [Analysen zeitgenöss. Bühnenwerke, Bd. 1.] Reclams Universalbibliothek. Nr. 6846. *Leipzig*: Reclam. o. J. 67 pp. M. —.40.

Hibler-Lebmansport, Leo.—Das mittelenglische Versgedicht *The Siege of Troye*. Eine philolog. Untersuch'g nebst e. Abdr. d. Hs. *Græz*: Moser, 1928. 17 x 26 cm. M. 5.

Hilka, Alfons.—Drei Erzählungen aus dem didaktischen Epos *L'Image du Monde* (Brandanus, Natura, Secundus). [Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte Nr. 13.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. vii, 69 pp. M. 1.80.

Hoffrichter, Leo.—Die ältesten französischen Bearbeitungen der Melusinsage. [Romanist. Arbeiten, Nr. 12.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. xi, 128 pp. M. 8.

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftl. Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. Hrsg. von d. Literaturarchiv-Gesellschaft in Berlin. (N. F. Bd. 5.) *Berlin*: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1928. Gr. 8°. xx, 219 pp. M. 18.

Könnecke, Gustav.—Quellen und Forschungen zur Lebensgeschichte Grimms. Hrsg. von J. H. Scholte. 2 Bde. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag, 1926-1928. 397 u. 372 pp. 18 Taf. M. 30.

Kranzmayer, Eberhard.—Die Synonyma für Kinn und Stirne in den Mundarten Altbayerns. [Sitzungsber. d. Bayer. Akademie d. Wissenschaften. Philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl. Jg. 68, Abh. 4.] *München*: R. Oldenbourg, 1927. 7 pp., 3 Kt. M. 150.

Mahling, Carl.—Über Tonvokal + ht im Frühmittelenglischen. *Leipzig*: Mayer und Müller, 1928. 200 pp. M. 8.

Meyer, Ernst A.—Ruhe und Richtung, Aktionsart und Satzon im Neuhochochdeutschen. [Aus: *Moderna Språk* Jg. 1927 u. 1928.] *Marburg i. H.*: N. G. Elwert, 1928. iv, 135 pp. M. 4.50.

Schnitzler, Arthur.—Der grüne Kakadu, Literatur, Die letzten Masken. Ed. with Introd., Notes, & Vocab. by Otto P. Schinnerer. *New York*: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928. xiv, 169 pp.

Scholz, Felix.—Clemens Brentano und Goethe. [Palacstra, 158.] *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1927. xii, 264 pp. M. 17.60.

Schuchmann, Hans.—Studien zum Dialog im Drama Lessings und Schillers. Diss. Teildruck. *Giessen*: 1927. 104 pp.

Schüdt, Heinr.—Wortbildung der Mundart von Wetterfeld (Oberhessen). [Giessener Beitr. z. deu. Philol. 20.] *Giessen*: v. Münchow, 1927. 56 pp. M. 2.

Schultze-Jahde, Karl.—Zur Gegenstandsbestimmung von Philologie und Literaturwissenschaft. Ein methodolog. Versuch. *Berlin*: E. Ebering, 1928. 256 pp. M. 6.90.

Sexauer, Ottmar.—Die Mundart von Pforzheim (Heidelberger Diss. 1925). [Form und Geist, 2.] *Leipzig*: H. Eichblatt, 1927. viii, 181 pp. M. 7.40.

Sturmfels, Wilhelm.—Die Ortsnamen Nassaus. Etymolog. Verz. d. Orts-, Fluss- und Bergnamen Nassaus. *Rüsselsheim. a. M.*: Wilh. Sturmfels, 1928. 77 pp. M. 3.

Tecchi, B.—Wackenroder. *Firenze*: Edizioni di Solaria, A. Carocci, 1927. 219 pp. L. 9.

Walde, Alois.—Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen. Hrsg. u. bearb. von Julius Pokorny. Bd. 1, Lfg. 1. *Berlin*: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1928. 162 pp. M. 15.

Wilhelm, Friedrich und Newald, Richard (ed.).—Poetische Fragmente des 12 u. 13. Jahrhunderts. [Germ. Bibl. III. Reihe: Lesebücher.] *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhdlg., 1928. vii, 49 pp. M. 2.

Winkler, Ernst.—Fercher von Steinwand im Leben und in der Dichtung. *Vilagcnfurt*: F. Kleinmayr, 1928. 96 pp., 2 Taf. M 1.50.

FRENCH

Baldensperger, F.—L'appel de la fiction orientale chez H. de Balzac. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1927. 31 pp. 70 cts.

Bédier, J.—Commentaires sur la Chanson de Roland. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 539 pp. Fr. 40.

Behrens, D.—Über englisches Sprachgut im Französischen. *Giessen*: Selbstverl. d. Roman Seminars, 1927. 264 pp.

Bellessort, A.—Sainte-Beuve et le xixe s. *Paris*: Perrin, 1927. Fr. 20.

Bourciez, J.—Recherches sur le parfait en Gascogne. *Bordeaux*: Feret, 1927. xvi + 251 pp.

Chateaubriand.—Le Génie du Christianisme, éd. V. Giraud. 2 vols. *Paris*: Firmin-Didot, 1928. xvii + 460 + 400 pp. Fr. 20.

Chrétien de Troyes.—Guillaume d'Angleterre, éd. M. Wilmotte. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 130 pp. Fr. 10. (Classiques fr. du m. a.)

Choderlos de Laclos.—Les liaisons dangereuses, éd. Ad. Van Bever. 2 vols. *Paris*: Crès, 1926. xxvii + 275 + 291 pp.

Churchman and Young.—Fr. Literature in outline. *New York*: Century, 1928. x + 322 pp.

Clausnitzer, O.—Die Kampfschilderung in den ältesten Chansons de geste. *Diss. Halle*: Jung, 1927. 115 pp.

Clédat, L.—Les origines latines du fr. *Paris*: Delalain, 1926. 94 pp.

Clouzot et Valensi.—Le Paris de la Comédie humaine. *Paris*: Le Goupy, 1927. 194 pp.

Cohen, G.—Le théâtre en Fr. au moyen âge. I. Le th. relig. *Paris*: Rieder, 1928. 110 pp., 59 illus. Fr. 16.50.

Cohnen, T.—Der Rhein in der franz. Lit. *Diss. Bonn*: 1926. 141 pp.

Courten, C. de.—Rondeaux di C. Marot. *Milan*: Alpes, 1927. 222 pp. L. 10.

De Corten, Clementina.—I "Rondeaux" di Clément Marot. *Milano*: Casa edit. "Alpes", 1927. 221 pp. L. 13.50.

Fejes, A.—Le théâtre naturaliste en Fr. *Diss. Lausanne*: 1925. 163 pp.

Fisher, H. A. L.—Paul Valéry. *New York*: Oxford Press, 1927. 22 pp. 70 cts.

Gautier, Th.—Emaux et Camées, éd. crit. de J. Madeleine. *Paris*: Hachette, 1927. xvi + 172 pp. Fr. 15.

—Ménagerie intime, ed. La Fontain-

erie. *New York*: Silver, Burdett, 1928. vii + 133 pp.

Gentile, F.—Pascal. Saggio d'interpretazione storica. *Bari*: Laterza e figli, 1927. 343 pp. L. 22. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 142.)

Giraud, V.—H. Taine. *Paris*: Vrin, 1928. 312 pp. Fr. 16.

Huguenin, C.—Modern Fr. writers (reader with vocab. and notes). *Boston*: Ginn, 1928. xvi + 270 pp. 92 cts.

Ivanoff, N.—La Marquise de Sablé et son salon. *Paris*: Croville, 1928. 246 pp. Fr. 30.

Knopf, A.—J. Lemaitre als Dramatiker. *Leipzig*: Pries, 1926. 133 pp. M 3.

Lacretelle, P. de.—Vie politique de V. Hugo. *Paris*: Hachette, 1928. Fr. 12.

La Fille du comte de Ponthieu, éd. C. Brunel. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. xiv + 60 pp. Fr. 5. (Classiques fr. du m. a.)

Langevin, E.—Louis Le Cardonnell. *Paris*: 1927. 32 pp. Fr. 8.

Larnac, J.—Colette. *Paris*. 1927. 230 pp. Fr. 15.

Lasserre, P.—Des Romantiques à nous. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. crit., 1927. 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Le Braz, A.—La légende de la mort chez les Bretons armoricains 2 vols. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 500 pp. Fr. 50.

Lefèvre, F.—Les sources de P. Claudel. *Paris*: Lemercier, 1927. 165 pp. Fr. 90.

Léger, Ch.—A la recherche de Balzac. *Paris*: Le Goupy, 1927. Fr. 50.

Le Goffic, C.—Les poètes de la mer du moyen âge à nos jours. *Paris*: Garnier, 1927. Fr. 12.

Lemercier, N.—Christophe Colomb, ed. C. Grimm. *New York*: Century, 1928. xix + 114 pp. 90 cts.

Les chansons de Perdigon, éd. H. J. Chaytor. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 74 pp. Fr. 6.

Lot, F.—La fin du monde antique et le début du moyen âge. *Paris*: Renaissance du livre, 1928. xxvi + 514 pp. Fr. 30.

Lugli, V.—Racine. *Roma*: A. F. Formigini, 1926. 72 pp. (Profili, no. 88.)

Martin, Dorothy.—Sextette. Trans. from the Fr. Symbolists. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1928. xv + 99 pp. 10 sh. 6 d.

Mauriac, F.—La vie de J. Racine. *Paris*: Plon, 1928. 256 pp. Fr. 15.

Mérimée, P.—Carmen, Arsène Guillot, l'Abbé Aubain, éd. A. Dupouy et G. d'Houville. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. (Œuvres complètes de P. M.)

Pinet, M.-J.—Christine de Pisan. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 465 pp

Praviel, A.—Du Romantisme à la prière. *Paris*: Perrin, 1927. Fr. 12.

Roe, F. C.—French travellers in Britain (1800-1926). *London*: Nelson, 1928. 246 pp. 2 sh. 6 d.

Rosny, J.-H.—Mémoires de la vie litt. *Paris*: Crès, 1927. 240 pp. Fr. 12.

Rousseau.—Lettres à M. de Malesherbes, éd. G. Rudler. *London*: Scholartis Press, 1928. 62 pp.

Royère, H.—Baudelaire mystique de l'amour. *Paris*: 1927. Fr. 80.

Rudwin, M.—Romantisme et satanisme. *Paris*: Belles Lettres 1928. 31 pp. Fr. 5

Schneegans.—Le théâtre édifant en Fl. aux 14^e et 15^e s. *Paris*: Boccard, 1928 160 pp. Fr. 7.

Seilliére, E.—Les Goncourt moralistes. *Paris*: Nouv. rev. crit., 1927. 224 pp. Fr 12.

Ségu, F.—Un maître de Balzac inconnu: H. de Latouche. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1928. Fr. 12.

Souriau, M.—Histoire du Romantisme en France. II. La décadence du Romantisme. *Paris*: Editions Spes, 1927. xv + 306 pp.

Spink and Mills.—Aventures de la famille Gautier. *Boston*: Ginn, 1928. vi + 249 pp. \$1.20.

Sporleder, P.—Han d'Islande u. seine Kopien in Hugos Romanen. Diss. *Frankfurt*: 1926. 97 pp.

Starkie.—Les sources du lyrisme d'E. Verhaeren. *Paris*: Boccard, 1928. 344 pp. Fr. 30.

Stauf, Ida.—Recherches sur ne redondant. Diss. *Paris*: Rousseau, 1927. 268 pp.

Stendhal.—Lucien Leuwen, éd. H. Debraye, préf. de Paul Valéry. Vols. I, III, IV. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. cxxxiv + 396 + 438 + 505 pp.

Urfé, H. d'.—L'Astrée, éd. Vaganay. Quatrième partie. *Lyons*: Masson, 1927. 813 pp.

Van der Zanden.—Etude sur le Purgatoire de saint Patrice. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1927. 178 pp.

Vincent, A.—Les noms de lieux de la Belgique. *Brussels*: Libr. Générale, 1927. 200 pp. Fr. 10.

Werner, E.—Die Darstellung des Empfindungsleben in der "Astrée." Würzburg diss. *Nürnberg*: Held, 1920. 96 pp.

Woodbridge, B. M.—La Semeuse (selections from Fr. authors with notes and vocab.). *Chicago*: U. of C. Press, 1928. xiv + 182 pp. \$1.50.

ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Il Convivio Introduzione e note di V. Piccoli. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. xxvii + 244 pp L. 10 (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 4.)

—La Divina Commedia, col commento di E. Bianchi. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1927. 778 pp L. 17

Antona-Traversi, C., e Ottolini, A.—Ugo Foscolo. Vol. I: Adolescenza e giovinezza, 1778-1804 *Milano*: Edizioni "Corbaccio," 1927. 287 pp L. 30 (Epoche, uomini, opere: collana di grandi monografie, no. I, 1.)

Bertacchi, G.—Il Giorno di Giuseppe Parni. lezioni di letteratura italiana tenute nell'anno accademico 1926-27 all' università di Padova. Appunti raccolti da Bice Stoppato. Fascicolo 1-7. *Padova*: Libr. G. Parisotto, 1927. 446 pp

Bindoni, G.—La cronologia dei Promessi Sposi; come complemento alla topografia del romanzo del medesimo autore. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1927. 157 pp. L. 6

Biondillo, F.—La poesia di Giovanni Meli. *Catania*: Studio edit. Moderno, 1926. 171 pp. L. 8.

Boccaccio, Giovanni.—Trattatello in laude di Dante, e pagine scelte del "Commento"; introduzione e glossario di G. Gervasoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 108 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 53-54.)

Bonghi, Ruggero.—Scritti manzoniani, a cura di G. Lesca. *Napoli*: F. Porrella, 1927. xvi + 123 pp. L. 8. (Biblioteca rara, terza serie, LXX-LXXII.)

Bottiglioni, G.—La penetrazione toscana e le regioni di Pomonte nei parlari di Corsica. Saggio di ricostruzione storico-linguistica. *Pisa*: F. Simoncini, 1926. 123 pp. Repr. fr. the "Italia dialettale," II, 2, 2—III, 3, 1.)

Cantù, Cesare.—Margherita Pusterla: racconto storico. *Sesto S. Giovanni-Milano*: A. Barion, 1927. 232 pp. L. 4.

Carducci, Giosuè.—Odi barbare. Con note di A. Albertazzi, con la collaborazione di A. Cesari, E. Lovarini, M. Pelaez, A. Saletti, R. Serra. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1927. 285 pp. L. 6.50.

Cavallotti, Felice.—Lea: dramma in tre atti in prosa, con un prologo in versi. La figlia di Jette: commedia in un atto. Cura radicale: scherzo comico in un atto in versi martelliani. *Sesto S. Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1927. 156 pp. L. 2.

Cazzamini Mussi, F.—Uomini e libri: saggi critici. *Palermo-Roma*: R. Sandron,

1927. xiv + 278 pp. L. 12. (Biblioteca Sandion di scienze e lettere, no. 114.)

Chatfield-Taylor, H. C.—Goldoni. Con prefazione di E. Maddalena. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. xv + 359 pp. L. 25. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 144.)

Cocchiara, G.—Folklore. *Milano*: U. Hoepli, 1927. x + 142 pp. L. 8.50. (Manuali Hoepli.)

Covello, L., and Giacobbe, A. E.—First Book in Italian. *New York*: The Macmillan Co., 1928. xv + 531 pp.

Croce, Benedetto.—Poeti e scrittori d'Italia, a cura di F. Del Secolo e G. Castellano. Vol. I. Da Dante a V. Cuoco. Vol. II. Da Alfieri a Pascoli. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1927. 2 vols., xii + 278, 369 pp. L. 16.50, 18.50. (Collezione scolastica Laterza.)

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—Ettore Fieramosca ossia la disfida di Barletta. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1927. 257 pp. L. 6. (Gemme per ogni famiglia.)

D'Azeglio Taparelli, L.—Un carteggio inedito coi fratelli Massimo e Roberto; con prefazione e note illustrative di E. Di Carlo. *Roma*: A. R. E., 1926. lxxxiv + 163 pp. L. 16.50.

De Bartholomaeis, V.—Le carte di Giovanni Maria Barbieri nell'archiginnasio di Bologna (r. Accademia delle scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna; classe di scienze morali). *Bologna*: L. Cappelli, 1927. 149 pp. L. 20.

Falcigno, D.—Un cultore delle Muse in veste episcopale: Paolo Regio degli Orseoli, 1541-1606. Monografia. Parte I: La Vita. *Napoli*: Tip. G. Lucina, 1927. 95 pp.

Faloci Pulgnani, M.—I Fioretti di S. Francesco. *Assisi*: Casa edit. Francescana, 1927. 51 pp.

Ferrari, Paolo.—Goldoni e le sue sedici commedie nuove: commedia storica in quattro atti. La medicina d'una ragazza malata: commedia in un atto. *Sesto S. Giovanni*: A. Barion, 1926. 171 pp. L. 2.

Francesco, San.—I Fioretti di —. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1926. 361 pp.

Galletti, A.—Alessandro Manzoni: il pensatore e il poeta. *Milano*: Soc. edit. "Unitas," 1927. 2 vols., xii + 426, 547 pp. L. 35.

Giusti, Giuseppe.—Poesie, con prefazione e note di A. Avancini. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1927. 416 pp. L. 7.50. (Collana di cultura classica.)

Gobetti, P.—Opera critica. Parte prima: arte, religione, filosofia. Parte seconda: teatro, letteratura, storia. *Torino*: Baretta, 1927. xi + 246, 340 pp. L. 14, 16.

Hauvette, H.—L'Arioste et la poésie chevaleresque à Ferrare au début du XVII^e siècle. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 390 pp. Fr. 60. (Bibliothèque littéraire de la Renaissance, nouvelle série, tome XVI.)

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Canti. *Firenze*: "Rinascimento del libro," 1927. 239 pp.

Lodi, L.—Alla ricerca della verecondia. Con scritti di G. Chiarini, E. Panzacchi, E. Nencioni (Polemiche). *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. xxii + 76 pp.

Machiavelli, Niccolò.—Il principe. *Firenze*: "Rinascimento del libro," 1927. lxxviii + 181 pp. (Classici.)

Melillo, G.—I dialetti del Gargano: saggio fonetico. *Pisa*: F. Simoncini, 1926. 106 pp.

Mignosi, P.—Profili e problemi. *Palermo*: A. Trimarchi, 1927. 160 pp. L. 10.

Monti, Vincenzo.—Cantiche; con introduzione e note a cura di G. Neppi. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1926. 125 pp. L. 2. (Biblioteca di letteratura, ni. 44-45.)

Nievo, Ippolito.—Le confessioni d'un ottuagenario. Pagine scelte per le scuole da D. Ercolini. *Torino*: Soc. edit. tip. Internazionale, 1927. vii + 570 pp. L. 16.

Pagano, L.—La fronda di Davide. Saggi critici. Boito, Pizzetti, Croce. *Torino*: Fratelli Bocca, 1928. 262 pp. L. 21.

Parini, Giuseppe.—Il Giorno: poemetto. Con introduzione e note di A. Avancini. *Milano*: A. Vallardi, 1927. 254 pp. L. 5.50. (Collana di cultura classica.)

—Dalla poesia di —: poemetti, odi, poesie varie; scelta e commento di G. Brognoligo. *Napoli*: G. Casella, 1927. xi + 380 pp. L. 10.

Parisi, A.—Contributo allo studio dell'enciclopedia nel ducato Estense; con prefazione di G. Bertoni. *Modena*: Tip. G. Ferraguti e C., 1926. iv + 64 pp. L. 9.

Pascoli, Giovanni.—Poesie, con note di L. Pietrobono. Seconda edizione riveduta e corretta. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1927. xiv + 313 pp. L. 12.

Pasini, F.—Luigi Pirandello (Come mi pare). *Trieste*: Biblioteca di cultura de "La vedetta italiana," 1927. 527 pp. L. 32. (Pagine di cultura diretta da G. Gall. Uberti, ni. 1-3.)

Porta, Carlo, e Grossi, Tommaso.—Raccolta completa delle poesie in dialetto milanese. *Milano*: A. Gorlini, 1926. 654 pp. L. 75.

Pullè, F. L.—Italia: genti e favelle. Disegno antropologico-linguistico. Vol. I; Vol. II. Parte I, II e appendici. *Torino*: Fratelli Bocca, 1927. 3 vols., xxvii + 359; xii + 310; xi + 313-610 pp. and atlas.

L. 380. (Biblioteca di scienze moderne Fratelli Bocca, n. 97-98.)

Scarlata, G.—Dalla selva all'Empireo: saggi dottrinali sulla "Divina Commedia" Palermo. Casa edit. "L'Attualità," 1927. 216 pp. L. 15.

Vossler, Karl.—La Divina Commedia studiata nella sua genesi e interpretata. Vol. I. parte I. La genesi religiosa e filosofica. Vol. I, parte II: Le genesi etico-politica. Vol. II, parte I La genesi letteraria. Traduzione di S. Jacini. Seconda edizione riveduta. Bari: G. Laterza e figli. 1927. 3 vols., 269, 295, 327 pp. L. 60. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, no. 34, 1-3.)

SPANISH

Alcázar, C.—Los hombres del reinado de Carlos III. Don Pablo de Olavide. Madrid: Voluntad, 1927.

Castro, Guillén de.—Obras. Tomo III. Madrid: R. A. E., 1927. xxxix + 673 pp. 20 ptas. (Biblioteca selecta de clásicos españoles. Segunda serie.)

Cervantes.—Teatro completo. Tomo I. Madrid: Hernando, 1927. xv + 372 pp. 3.50 ptas. (Biblioteca Clásica, 197)

—Don Chisciotte della Mancia. Trad. e note di A. Giannini. Vol. IV. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1927. 376 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca Sansoniana straniera, no. 02.)

Grinnell, G. B.—Audubon Park. The History of the site of the Hispanic Society of America and neighbouring Institutions. New York: 1927. 25 pp. (Hispanic Notes and Monographs Issued by the H. S. of A.)

Grummon and Noriega.—Tres Meses in México. New York: Scribner's, 1928. xiii + 321 pp.

León Sánchez, M.—Angel Ganivet. Su vida y su obra. México: M. L. Sánchez, 1927. 15 pp.

Medina, J. T.—Nuevos Chilenismos, registrados en el Diccionario Manual Ilustrado de la Real Academia de la Lengua, con indicación de barbarismos, galicismos, neologismos, vulgarismos, y del mal uso de ciertos vocablos, reunidos y en parte comentados por don — Santiago de Chile: Imp. Universitaria, 1927. 74 pp.

Mena, R.—Filigranas o marcas transparentes en papeles de Nueva España del siglo XVI. México: Imp. de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1926. 29 pp. (Monografías Bibliográficas Mexicanas, 5.)

Menéndez y Pelayo, M.—Antología de poetas líricos castellanos. Tomo XIV. Boscón y Garcilaso de la Vega. Con un estudio crítico por J. Rogerio Sánchez. Madrid: Hernando, 1927. cvii + 267 pp. 3.50 ptas. (Biblioteca Clásica, CXXXVII.)

—Estudios de crítica literaria. Primera serie. Tercera edición. Madrid: Hernando, 1927. 347 pp. 5 ptas. (Colección de Escritores Castellanos Críticos. Vol. XV.)

—Horacio en España. Solaces bibliográficos. Tomo I Tercera ed. Madrid: Hernando, 1926. 415 pp. 5 ptas. (Col. de Esc. Cast., XXVII)

Pérez Pastor, C.—Noticias y documentos relativos a la Historia y Literatura Españolas, tomo IV Madrid: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1926. viii + 491 pp. 10 ptas. (Memorias de la Real Academia Española, t. XIII)

Puccini, M.—Vincenzo Blasco-Ibáñez. Roma: A. F. Formiggini, 1926. 64 pp. (Medaglie)

Ruppert y Ujaravi, R.—Spanisches Lesebuch mit Einführung in die Kultur Spaniens für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene. München: Lindauersehe Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1927. viii + 165 pp.

Saavedra, A.—Don Alvaro. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by S. L. Millard Rosenberg and E. H. Templin. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928. xxx + 193 pp. \$1.25.

San Alberto, J. A. de.—Carta a los indios infieles chiriguano [1790?]. Nota preliminar, biografía y bibliografía de J. T. Medina. Buenos Aires: J. Peuser, 1927. lx + 45 pp. (Bibl. Argentina de Libros Raros Americanos. Tomo IV.)

Solar Correa, E.—Poetas de Hispano-América. Santiago de Chile: Imp. Cervantes, 1926. 300 pp.

Suñé Benages, J.—Elogio de Cervantes a Barcelona. Barcelona: Imp. de la Casa Provincial de Caridad, 1927. 77 pp.

Teseo, J.—Fábulas y apólogos en verso. Siglos XVI al XX. Madrid: Sues. de Rivadeneira, 1926. 111 pp. 1.25 ptas.

Valera, J.—Cuentos. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1927. 321 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras escogidas, XI)

Vanossi, R.—Catálogo de las publicaciones periódicas existentes en la Biblioteca de la Sociedad Científica Argentina. Buenos Aires: Compañía Impresora Argentina, 1927. 201 pp.

Vindel, F.—Pedro Medina y su Libro de Grandezas y cosas memorables de España. Descripción ilustrada con facsimiles y notas sobre esta obra con una pequeña biografía y bibliografía. Madrid: Tip. J. Góngora, 1927. 38 pp. 20 ptas.

Viñas de S. Luis, T.—Versiones latinas de poetas hispanos. Barcelona: Imp. de Publicaciones Calasancias, 1927. liv + 335 pp.

Wacker, G.—Spanisches Lesebuch zur Einführung in die Kultur Spaniens. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1927. xvi + 131 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The English list includes only books received.]

Ainsworth, Oliver Morley (ed.).—Milton on Education, The Tractate *Of Education* with Supplementary Extracts from Other Writings of Milton (Cornell Studies in English XII). Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. xi + 369. \$2.75.

Bradby, G. F.—The Problems of Hamlet. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 60 \$0.50.

Brauchli, Jakob.—Der englische Schauerroman um 1800 unter Berücksichtigung der unbekannten Bücher, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Volksliteratur. Weida: Buchdruckerei Thomas & Hubert, 1928 Pp. 261.

Brie, Friedrich.—Imperialistische Strömungen in der englischen Literatur (2d ed.). Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1928. Pp. xiv + 285. M. 11.

Cross, Wilbur L.—The Modern English Novel. Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. iii + 42. \$1.00.

Doughty, Oswald (ed.).—The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to his Publisher, F. S. Ellis. London: The Scholartis Press, 1928.

Flasdieck, Hermann M.—Der Gedanke einer englischen Sprachakademie (Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen, XI). Jena: Frommannschen Buchhandlung, 1928. Pp. viii + 246. M. 13.

Foerster, Norman.—American Criticism, a Study in Literary Theory from Poe to the Present. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1928. Pp. xviii + 261. \$3.50.

Gordon, George.—Shakespeare's English (S. P. E. Tract No. XXIX). New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 255-276. \$1.00.

Haas, C. E. de.—Nature and the Country in English Poetry. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1928. Pp. vi + 301. \$2.50.

Habbema, D. M. E. An Appreciation of Colley Cibber Actor and Dramatist together with a Reprint of his Play 'The Careless Husband.' Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1928. Pp. vi + 190. 6 s. 6 d.

Krog, Fritz.—Studien zu Chaucer und Langland (Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 65, J. Hoops, ed.). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928. Pp. xii + 174. M. 9.

Lawrence, William Witherle.—Beowulf and Epic Tradition. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xiv + 349. \$3.50.

Murdock, Kenneth B.—A Leaf of Grass from Shady Hill, with a review of Walt Whitman's 'Leaves of Grass' written by Charles Eliot Norton in 1855. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. 31.

Partridge, E. (ed.).—Orion: by R. H. Horne with an Introduction on Horne's Life and Work (Nineteenth-Century Highways and Byways Series, No. 4). London: The Scholartis Press, 1928. Pp. xxxvii + 131. 7 s. 6 d.

Potter, George Reuben (ed.).—Elizabethan Verse and Prose (Non-dramatic). New York: Holt, 1928. Pp. xiv + 615. \$4.00. [A large volume including some seventy authors and many long extracts but omitting the *Faerie Queene*. Forty pages of notes, no biographical or critical introductions.]

Reed, Amy L. (ed.).—Letters from Brook Farm, 1844-1847, by Marianne Dwight. Poughkeepsie: Vassar College, 1928. Pp. xv + 191.

Schlauch, Margaret.—Medieval Narrative, a Book of Translations. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1928. Pp. vii + 456. \$2.50.

Schutt, J. H.—An Introduction to English Literature for Secondary Schools. Vol. I. *The Hague*: J. B. Wolters' U. M., 1928. Pp. xi + 386. Fl. 4, 25. [Vol. I, through Milton. Well printed, with many pictures, copious extracts, and excellent comment.]

Smith, A. H.—The Place-Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire (English Place-Name Society, Vol. V). Cambridge University Press, 1928. Pp. xlv + 352.

Thompson, Stith (Tr.).—Antti Aarne's The Types of the Folk-Tale, a Classification and Bibliography (F. F. Communications, Vol. XXV, No. 74). *Helsinki*: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1928. Pp. 279.

Tucker, Lena Lucile and Benham, Allen Rogers.—A Bibliography of Fifteenth Century Literature with Special Reference to the History of English Culture (University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature, Vol. 2, No. 3). *Seattle*: University of Washington Press, 1928. Pp. 162.

White, Newman I.—American Negro Folk-Songs. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xii + 501. \$5.00.

Wimberly, Lowry Charles.—Folklore in the English and Scottish Ballads. University of Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. xvi + 466. \$5.00.

Zachrisson, R. E.—Thomas Hardy as Man, Writer, and Philosopher; an Appreciation with a Swedish Hardy Bibliography. *Uppsala*: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri A. B., 1928. Pp. 29. 1: 75 kr.

GERMAN

Bachert, Ruth.—Morikes Maler Nolten. [Von deutscher Poeterey, Bd. 1.] *Leipzig*: J. J. Weber, 1928. vii, 75 pp. M. 4. (Originally diss. Giessen).

Bahn, Karl.—Marianne von Willemer, Goethes Suleika. *Berlin*: B. Behr, 1928. 101 pp. M. 2.50.

Betz, Frederick and Gottlieb, A.—Modern German Reader. Deutschland in Wort und Bild. *Boston*: Heath [1928]. viii, 285 pp. \$1.40.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn. Unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Fachgenossen nach dem Tode von J. W. Nagl u. J. Zeidler hrsg. Dritter (Schluss-) Band 1848-1918. 4 Abt. *Wien*: Fromme, 1927. Pp. 481-640. M. 8.40.

Clivio, Josef.—Lessing und das Problem der Tragödie. [Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 5]. *Horgen-Zürich*: Munster-Presse, 1928. 164 pp. M. 7.60.

Damköhler, Eduard.—Nordharzer Wörterbuch. Auf Grundlage der Cattenstedter Mundart. [Forschungen zur Geschichte des Harzgebietes Bd. 4]. *Wernigerode, Quedlinburg*: H. C. Huch. 1927. xiii, 232 pp. 4°. M. 6.

Diamond, William, and Uhlenhof, Bernhard A.—Mitten im Leben. Short Stories from contemporary German Literature, ed. with introductions, notes, exercises, and vocabulary. *New York*: Holt [1928]. iv, 339 pp. \$1.60.

Ebner-Eschenback, Marie V.—Die Kapitalistinnen und zwei andere Novellen. Ed. with introd., notes, exercises and vocab. by Clifford E. Gates. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1928. viii, 122 pp. \$1.20.

Faust, Albert B.—Heine's Prose with introduction and notes. Revised edition. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1928. li, 426 pp. \$1.50.

Heyd, J. W.—Anfänger Deutsch. *Milwaukee*: Bruce Publishing Co. [1928]. 212 pp. \$1.28.

Ischer, Anna.—Albrecht von Haller und das klassische Altertum. [Sprache und Dichtung, H. 41]. *Bern*: Haupt, 1928. 272 pp. M. 6.40.

Janetzky, Chr.—Joh. Caspar Lavater. [Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, Bdch. 53]. *Frauenfeld*: Huber & Co. [1928]. 129 pp. M. 2.40.

Knotterus-Meyer, Hermann.—Der unbekannte Löns. Gespräche u. Erinnerungen. *Jena*: E. Diederichs, 1928. vii, 177 pp. M. 3.50.

Kraus, Carl v.—Über Wolframs Parzival. Rede. [Münchener Universitätsreden H. 11]. *München*: Max Hueber, 1928. 16 pp. 75 Pf.

Leichenring, Max.—Opfersteine und heilige Haine Westsachsens sowie die darauf bezuglichen altgerm. Flur- u. Ortsnamen im Spiegel der deutschen Sprache. *Rochlitz*: B. Pretzsch, 1928. 278 pp. M. 8.

Losch, Friedr.—Die Brautwerbungssage der deutschen Spielmannsdichtung. Bausteine zu einer deutschen Edda. 1. König Oswald. Die deutsche Sage aus d. Texten der Gedichte u. d. Legende wiederhergestellt. *München*: Suddutsche Monatshefte, 1928. vii, 142 pp. M. 3.50.

Matthey, Walther.—Die historischen Erzählungen des Carl Franz van der Velde (1779-1824). [Tübinger germanist. Arbeiten. Bd. 4]. *Stuttgart*: W. Kohlhammer, 1928. vi, 144 pp. M. 6.

Meyen, Fritz.—Ibsen-Bibliographie. Mit einer Einführung: Ibsen und Deutschland von W. Mohring. [Nordische Bibliographie. Reihe 1, H. 1]. *Braunschweig*: Westermann, 1928. 40 pp. 4°. M. 2.40.

Michalek, Ludwig.—Goethes Heimstätten. Bilder und Skizzen, mit einem Begleitwort von Hans Wahl. Hrsg. von Rudolf Payer von Thurn. *Wien*: Hermes, Buch- u. Kunstdr. E. & G. Urban, 1928. v, 8 pp., 12 plates 33 × 48 cm. M. 10.

Narciss, Georg Adolf.—Studien zu den Frauenzimmergesprächspielen Georg Philipp Harsdörffers (1607-1658). Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Literaturgesch. d. 17. Jhs. [Form u. Geist, H. 5]. *Leipzig*: H. Eichblatt, 1928. vii, 221 pp. M. 9.

Noordhoek, W. J.—Gellert und Holland. Ein Beitrag zu d. Kenntnis d. geistigen u. literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Deutschland u. Holland im 18. Jh. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1928. v, 165 pp.

Schatz, Josef.—Althochdeutsche Grammatik. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1927. viii, 352 pp. M. 12.

Schmidt, Friedr.—Die Erneuerung des Epos. Eine geschichtsphilos. Betrachtung zu Spittlers "Olympischem Frühling." [Beiträge zur Ästhetik. 17]. *Leipzig*: Leop. Voss, 1928. vi, 111 pp. M. 6.60.

Sommer, Paul.—Erläuterungen zu Konr. Ferd. Meyers "Gustav Adolfs Page." [Königs Erläuterungen z. d. Klassikern. Bdch. 208]. *Leipzig*: Herm. Beyer [1928]. 43 pp. 60 Pf.

Stauf von der March, Ottokar.—Die nordmährischen Mundarten nebst Wörterverzeichnis. Beiträge zur deutschen Volkskunde. *Brünn*: Deutschmährische Heimat, 1927. 99 pp. Kř 12.

Tau, Max.—Landschafts- und Ortsdarstellung Theodor Fontanes. [Epische Gestaltung, Bd. 1]. *Oldenburg*: Schulztesche Hofbuchdr., 1928. iv, 121 pp. M. 3.50.

Voigt, Friedr. Ad.—Sören Kierkegaard im Kampf mit der Romantik, der Theologie und der Kirche. *Berlin*: Fricke-Verl., 1928. 426 pp. M. 10.

Wrede, Adam.—Altkölnischer Sprachschatz. Auf Grund archivalischer Quellenstoffe der Reichsstadt Köln von 12. Jh bis 1815 als Wörterbuch bearb. u. hrsg. Lfg. 1. *Bonn*: F. Klopp, 1928. 64 pp.

Zobel, Arthur.—Die Verneinung im Schlesischen. [Wort und Brauch, H. 18] *Breslau*: M. & H. Marcus, 1928. xvi, 267 pp. M. 15.

FRENCH

Allen, P. S. and Jones, H. M.—The Romanesque Lyric (50-1050 A. D.). *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C. Press, 1928. xviii + 373 pp. \$4.50.

Banfi Malaguzzi, Daria.—Storia di Messer Tristano e dei buoni cavalieri di Bretagna. *Milano*: "Aples," 1927. 429 pp. L. 16.50.

Barton and Sirich.—Fr. review grammar and composition. *New York*: Crofts, 1928. xi + 241 pp.

Boileau-Despreaux, Nicolas.—Art poétique, avec introduction et notes par L. Bosisio. *Torino*: Soc. edit. Internazionale, 1927. xxiv + 68 pp. L. 5. (Les classiques français.)

Bouvier, A.—Le poète Colardeau. *Orleans*: Impr. Moderne, 1927. 156 pp.

Canzone di Rolando, La, nel testo di Oxford ms. Digby 23, e nella traduzione di Carlo Raimondo, con prefazione di Pierre de Nolhac dell'Accademia di Francia e di Pio Rajna, senatore del Regno. *Milano*: Bottega di poesia, 1927. xx + 143 pp. L. 45.

Cella, A.—La tragédie de la femme dans le théâtre d'A. de Musset. Diss. *Zagreb*: 1927.

Charpentier, J.—La vie meurtrie d'A. de Musset. *Paris*: Piazza, 1928. Fr. 15.

Clausnitzer, O.—Die Kampfschilderung in den ältesten chansons de geste. Diss. *Halle*: Jung, 1926. 115 pp.

Crawford, W. R.—The freeman's morals. Philosophy of Remy de Gourmont. Penn. diss. *Philadelphia*: 1926. 50 pp.

Doutrepont, G.—Les types populaires de la litt. fr. 1re p. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 500 pp. Fr. 40.

Dugas, M.—Verlaine. *Paris*: Radot, 1928. Fr. 15.

Durry, M.-J.—L'ambassade romaine de Chateaubriand. *Paris*: Champion, 1927. 172 pp.

Erckmann-Chatrian—Le Trésor du vieux seigneur. *New York*: Holt, 1928. xvii + 198 pp.

Fissen, K.—Das leben des heiligen Nikolaus in der altfranz. Literatur. Diss. *Göttingen*: 1921. 104 pp.

France, A.—Les enfants, ed. Hugh A. Smith and L. B. Johnson. *New York*: Holt, 1928. vi + 209 pp.

Gleich, L.—Der landschaftliche Charakter der Geste des Loherens. Diss. *Munich*: Rennebohm & Hausknecht, 1925. ix + 57 pp.

Grolleau et Garnier.—Un logis de J. K. Huysmans. *Paris*: Crès, 1928. 75 pp. Fr. 18.

Gros, G.—L'Amour dans le roman de la rose. *Paris*: Bibl. du lettré. 221 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Groth, P.-M.—Altfranz countes und acontier. Diss. *Munich*: 1926. 40 pp.

Gutkind, C. S.—Molière und das komische Drama. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. 193 pp. M. 9.

Hauteœur, etc.—Le Romantisme et l'art. *Paris*: Laurens, 1928. 328 pp., 48 illus. Fr. 40.

Holbrook, R. T.—Guillaume Alecis et Pathelin. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1928. xi + 128 pp. (U. of Cal. Pubs. in Mod. Philology).

Inklaar, D.—Baculard d'Arnaud, ses imitateurs en Hollande. *The Hague*: Smits, 1925. xi + 426 pp.

Joseph, D. L.—Souvenirs et esprit napoléoniens chez Balzac. Toulouse diss. *Paris*: Gautard, 1924. 179 pp.

Knopf, A.—Jules Lemaitre als dramtiker. Diss. *Leipzig*: Pries, 1926. 133 pp.

Levengood, S. L.—The use of color in the verse of the Pléiade. Princeton diss. *Paris*: Presses universitaires, 1927. 124 pp.

Martin, E.-L.—Les symétries de la prose dans les romans de V. Hugo. Diss. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1925. 131 pp.

Martin, H. G.—Fénelon en Hollande. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1928. viii + 230 pp.

Matulka, B.—The Cid as a courtly hero: from the *Amadis* to Corneille. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1928. 54 pp. \$0.75.

Moore and Havens.—Selected Stories from G. de Maupassant. *Boston*: Ginn, 1928. xxiii + 252 pp.

Mossner, W.—Die Übersetzungsweise des Perrot d'Abancourt, u. ihre Einwirkung

auf Vaugelas. Erlangen diss. *Nuremberg*: Hilz, 1927. 98 pp.

Mullins, M.—La famille au XVII^e s. d'après Molière. Toulouse diss. *Toulouse*: Privat, 1927. 180 pp.

Norman, Hilda.—Swindlers and Rogues in Fr Drama. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1928. xii + 259 pp. \$3.00.

Oláh, L.—Une grande dame, auteur dram. et poète au XVIII^e s, Mme de Montesson. *Paris*: Champion, 1928. 208 pp.

Oliver, T. E.—The *Mérope* of George Jeffreys as a source of Voltaire's *Mérope*. *Urbana*: U. of Ill. Press, 1927. 111 pp. \$1.00. (U. of Ill. Studies in Lang and Lit.)

Palmarocchi, R.—Letteratura francese contemporanea. *Roma*: Soc. edit. "La Voce," 1927. vi + 325 pp. L. 15.

Remy, G.—René Le Pays. *Paris*: Ass. des étudiants, 1925. Lille diss. 288 pp.

—Portrait de M. Le Pays. *Ibid.* 73 pp.

Rheinfelder, H.—Das wort "Persona." *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. xiv + 199 pp. (Z. R. Ph Heft 77).

Rousseau.—Il contratto sociale, cd. F. Varvello. *Turin*: Soc. editrice internazionale. 399 pp. L. 13.

Simon, B.—Fr. topical ex. pad. *New York*: Globe, 1928. 30 pp. 40 cts.

Swann and Fontaine.—Ex. book in Fr. *New York*: Globe, 1928. vi + 152 pp. 93 cts.

Temporius, H.—A. Samains Leben, Persönlichkeit und Stil. Bonn diss. *Oberlahnstein*: Nohr, 1926. 45 pp.

Timmermans, B.—Le spinozisme de Maeterlinck. Groningen diss. *Zalt-Bommel*: Van de Garde, 1924. xi + 196 pp.

Tragédie du Sac de Cabrière.—Ed. K. Christ. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1928. v + 132 pp. M. 6.

Verhaeren, E.—P. Verlaine. *Paris*: La Centaine, 1928. Fr. 30.

Vigny, A. de.—Journal d'un poète, nouvelle éd., revue et aug. p. F. Baldensperger. *London*: Scholaris Press, 1928. xxiv + 264 pp.

Völcker, O.—Das Bildungswesen in Fr. *Braunschweig*: Westermann, 1927. 286 pp.

Weingärtner, P.—Quellenverhältnis u. Allegorie in der Prise amoureuse des Jehan Acart de Hesdin. Diss. *Würzburg*: 1926. 90 pp.

Witthoff, J.—Das Motiv des Zweikampfes zwischen Vater und Sohn in der franz. Lit. Bonn diss. *Nuremberg*: Hilz, 1921. 68 pp.

Wulff, F.—Om Oredan i den modärna franska Värsläran. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1927. 51 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, V.—Agamennone; con introduzione e commento di Anna Riccioli. *Catania*: C. Galàtola, 1927. 105 pp. L. 4. (Arte e letteratura, no. 2.)

Alighieri, Dante.—La Divina Commedia. Inferno. *Sesto S. Giovanni-Milano*: A. Barion, 1927. 207 pp. L. 150.

Antona-Traversi, C., e Ottolini, A.—Ugo Foscolo Vol. II: Maturità (1804-1810). *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1927. 344 pp. L. 30. (Epocche, uomini, opere: collana di grandi monografie, no. I, 1, 2.)

Antonini, G.—Il teatro contemporaneo in Italia. *Milano*: Ediz. "Corbaccio," 1927. 409 pp. L. 12.

Asín Palacios, M.—Dante y el Islam. Vol. I. Serie B. *Madrid*: Ed. "Voluntad," 1927. 327 pp.

Bandello, Matteo.—Novelle; a cura di F. Picco. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. xv + 194 pp. (Classici del ridere, no. 66.)

Barberino, Francesco da.—I documenti d'amore; secondo i manoscritti originali, a cura di F. Egidi. Vol. III, fasc. 40; vol. IV. *Roma*: Soc. filologica romana, 1924-1927. 273-470; xlviii + 144 pp. L. 30; 45. (Società filologica romana, fasc. 14-15.)

Bernardino da Siena, San.—Prediche scelte, a cura di don Giovanni Minozzi. *Milano*: "Amatrix," 1927. lxxvi + 376 pp. L. 16 50. (Il pensiero cristiano.)

Bertana, E.—Saggi pariniani. *Aquila*: Casa edit. tip. Vecchioni, 1926. vii + 242 pp. L. 12. (Collana di storie e lettere diretta da G. Ferretti, no. 1.)

Bertoni, G.—Lodovico Ariosto. Conferenza tenuta nella Salla del tricolore di Reggio Emilia il 27 febbraio 1927. *Reggio Emilia*: Ist. edit. libr. emiliano, 1927. 22 pp. L. 2.50. (Quaderni de "La Provincia di Reggio," no. 11. Repr. fr. "La Provincia di Reggio," ni. 3-4.)

Chiari, G.—La vita di Ugo Foscolo. Nuova edizione con un discorso sul Foscolo e un'appendice di note bibliografiche a cura di G. Mazzoni. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1927. xli + 487 pp. L. 18.

Cominelli, R.—Il retto ordinamento dei "Trionfi" di Francesco Petrarca. *Salò*: G. Devoti, 1927. 25 pp. L. 2.

Crocioni, G.—Il poeta Adolfo De Bosis. Con xilografie di Bruno da Osimo. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1927. 74 pp. L. 6.

Ferretti, L.—Carducci e la letteratura inglese. *Milano*: "S. T. I. G. E.," 1927. 30 pp. (Per nozze Agnesi-Fabbri.)

Foà, A.—Ugo Foscolo: L'amore in Ugo Foscolo; Ugo Foscolo poeta della bellezza e del mistero. *Torino*: G. B. Petrini, 1927. 238 pp. L. 12.

Foscolo, Ugo.—L'orazione inaugurale ("Dell'origine e dell'ufficio della letteratura") ristampata a cura della r. università di Pavia nel primo centenario della morte del poeta. Avvertenza di I. Sanesi. *Pavia*: Tip. Cooperativa, 1927. 36 pp.

Fradeletto, A.—Ugo Foscolo: commemorazione. *Venezia*: Tip. C. Ferrari, 1927. 31 pp.

Francesco, San.—Laudes creaturarum, a cura di E. Cavallero e L. Calò. *Napoli*: Tip. Contessa, 1927. 10 pp.

Guerrazzi, F. D.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da Sabatino Lopez. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1927. v + 307 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, vol. 37.)

Lugiato, L.—Pazzi squilibrati e delinquenti nelle opere dei letterati Vol. II. Emilio Zola. La famiglia dei Rougon-Macquart. *Bergamo*: C. Conti e C., 1927. 303 pp. L. 15.

Mameli, Goffredo.—La vita e gli scritti, a cura di A. Codignola. Vol. I: La vita. Vol. II: Gli scritti. Edizione del centenario. *Venezia*: "La nuova Italia," 1927. 2 vols., viii + 378; vii + 447 pp. L. 37.50; 45.

Maylender, M.—Storia delle accademie d'Italia. Vol. I: Abbagliati-Centini. Vol. II: Certi-Filotomi. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1927. 2 vols., xxiv + 541, 458 pp.

Mazzini, Giuseppe.—Lettere inedite. Il più grande esule all'esule Carlo Blind. *Napoli*: Soc. edit. Partenopea di G. Rocco, 1927. 198 pp. L. 8.

Palmieri, E.—Interpretazioni del mio tempo. II: G. A. Borgese. *Napoli*: G. Casella, 1928. 129 pp. L. 7.

Parini, Giuseppe.—Poesie e prose. *Firenze*: A. Salani, 1927. 536 pp. L. 6. [I classici; edizione Florentia, no. 48.]

Pescetti, L.—Bibliografia volterrana. Fasc. 10. *Volterra*: A. Vanzi, 1927. 18 pp.

Picco, F.—Il Cavalier Marino. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1927. 92 pp. (Profili, no. 93.)

Poliziano, Angelo.—Le Stanze per la Giostra; L'Orfeo. Con introduzione e glossario a cura di E. Rho. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1927. 89 pp. L. 1. (Biblioteca di letteratura, no. 50.)

Polo, Marco.—Il Milione. Prima edizione integrale a cura di L. F. Benedetto, sotto il patronato della città di Venezia. *Firenze*: L. S. Olshki, 1928. 4to., ccxxi + 281 pp. L. 600. (Comitato geografico nazionale italiano, no. 3.)

Pulci, Luigi.—Il Morgante. Introduzione e note di G. Fatini. *Torino*: Unione edit.

torinese, 1927. 2 vols., xxiv + 342, 380 pp. L. 12 each. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, vol. 47-48.)

Recchia, L.—Dante Alighieri e la sua opera maggiore. Studio letterario ed analisi estetica. Ad uso delle persone colte ed amanti del sapere. *Putignano*: Tip. A. De Robertis e fo., 1927. 45 pp. L. 3.

Saya, E.—La letteratura italiana dal 1870 ad oggi. Poesia, prosa, teatro. Schema storico. *Firenze*: A. Rossini, 1928. 318 pp. L. 10.

Taranto, C. di.—La vita paesana in Capitanata *Matera*: Tip. edit. Conti, 1927. 241 pp. L. 15.

Tecchi, B.—Il dramma del Foscolo. *Firenze*: Ediz. "Solaria," 1927. 73 pp. L. 5. (Edizioni di "Solaria," quaderno 5.)

Zaccaria, E.—L'elemento iberico nella lingua italiana. *Bologna*: L. Cappelli, 1927. 511 pp. L. 40.

Zoncada, A.—Salomone Eugenio Camerini. Studio critico-biografico. *Pesaro*: La Poligrafica, 1927. 147 pp.

Zonta, G.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. I: Il medioevo. Disp. la. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. 64 pp. L. 10.

SPANISH

Alonso Cortés, N.—La muerte del Conde de Villamediana. *Valladolid*: Imp. del Colegio de Santiago, 1928. 95 pp.

—Pleitos y pleitistas. *Valladolid*: Imp. de la Casa Social Católica, 1927. 46 pp.

Antología poética en honor de Góngora con motivo del III Centenario de su muerte (1627-1927), desde Lope de Vega a Rubén Darío Recogida por Gerardo Diego. *Madrid*: Gráficas Modernas, 1927. 220 pp. 5 ptas.

Bullón, E.—Un colaborador de los Reyes Católicos: el Dr. Palacio Rubios y sus obras. *Madrid*: R. Velasco, 1927. xi + 400 pp.

Calderón, —La mogiganga de la muerte. Texto de A. Valbuena Prat, con un prefacio de Azorín y un apéndice por J. B. Trend. *Madrid-Paris-Buenos Aires*: a expensas de la Agrupación de Amigos del Libro de Arte, 1927. viii + 45 pp.

Cancionero de Baena.—Reproduced in facsimile from the unique manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Foreword by H. R. Lang. *New York*: Hispanic Society of America, 1926. vi + 202 fols.

Darío, R.—Poemas de adolescencia. Segunda edición. *Madrid*: G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1926. 216 pp. (Obras completas, ordenadas y prologadas por A. Ghirardo y A. González Blanco, vol. I.)

Dario, R.—Poemas de juventud. Segunda edición. *Madrid*: G. Hernández y G. Sáez, 1926. 224 pp. (Obras completas, ordenadas y prologadas por A. Ghirardo y A. González Blanco, vol. II.)

Espronceda, J. de.—El Diablo Mundo. Juicio crítico de J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly. *Madrid*: Blass, 1927. 244 pp. 2.30 ptas (Bibliotecas populares Cervantes, vol. XI.)

García Icazbalceta, J.—Catálogo de la Colección de Manuscritos relativos a la Historia de América. Aumentado y adicionado por F. Gómez de Orozco. *México*: Imp. de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. xv + 287 pp. (Monografías bibliográficas mexicanas. Núm. 9.)

García Rey, V.—Nuevas noticias referentes al poeta Garcilaso de la Vega. *Madrid*: Hauser y Menet, 1927. 36 pp.

Gómez de la Serna, R.—Seis falsas novelas. *Santander*: Aldus, S. A. Artes Gráficas, 1927. 250 pp. 5 ptas. (Agencia Mundial de Librería, París-Madrid-Lisboa.)

Kane, E. K.—Gongorism and the Golden Age. A study of exuberance and unrestraint in the arts. *Chapel Hill*: The University of North Carolina Press, 1928. xvi + 275 + xxiv pp. \$3.50.

Luna, H. de.—La segunda parte de la vida de Lazarillo de Tormes. Ed. with introduction and notes by E. R. Sims. *Austin*: The University of Texas, 1928. xxviii + 138 pp.

Menéndez Pidal, R.—El idioma español en sus primeros tiempos. *Madrid*: Ed. Voluntad, 1927. 258 pp. (Colección Hispania. Vol. II, serie B.) [Resumen de la obra *Orígenes del español*.]

Morales Oliver, L.—Arias Montano y la política de Felipe II en Flandes. *Madrid*: Voluntad, 1927. 360 pp. (Colección "Hispania." Vol. IV, Serie F.)

Northup, G. T.—El Cuento de Tristán de Leonís. Ed. from the unique manuscript Vatican 6428. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Press, 1928. 298 pp. \$5.00.

Ortega y Gasset, J.—El Espectador. Tomo VI. *Madrid*: Tip. Artística, 1927. 187 pp. (Revista de Occidente.)

—Espíritu de la letra. *Madrid*: Tip. Artística, 1927. 194 pp. (Revista de Occidente.)

Piñero, N.—Discurso Sobre Bartolomé Mitre. *Buenos Aires*: Tall. Gráf. "Damián," 1927. 102 pp.

Ramírez, A. F.—Florilegio de Poetas y Escritores Oaxaqueños. *México*: Imp. de Muguña, 1927. 640 pp.

Ríos, F. de los.—Religión y Estado en la España del siglo XVI. *Nueva York*: Instituto de las Españas, 1927. 114 pp. 3 ptas.

Saavedra Fajardo.—Idea de un príncipe político cristiano representada en cien empresas. II. Ed. y notas de V. García de Diego. *Madrid*: "La Lectura," 1927. 300 pp. (Clásicos Castellanos, 81.)

Saralegui y Medina, M. de.—Escarceos filológicos. El testamento de Colón. Juan Verdades. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1928. 387 pp. (Obras póstumas.)

Unamuno, M. de.—Pages choisies. Preface, traduction et notes de Maurice Vallis. *Paris*: J. Povolozky et Cie., 1923. 152 pp. (Extraits essentiels des Grands Moralistes et Penseurs.)

Valencina, D. de.—Poesías inéditas, atribuidas al maestro fray Luis de León. *Sevilla*: Imp. de la Divina Pastora, 1928. 22 pp.

CATALAN

Alcover y Sureda, A. M., y Moll y Casanovas, F. de B.—Diccionari català-valencià-balear. Tomo I. Fascicle 3: abocador-acastellar. *Palma de Mallorca*: [1927]. pp. 49-112.

Galí, A.—L'ensenyament de l'ortografia als infants. *Barcelona*: Ed. Mentora. S. A., 1926. 75 pp. 2 ptas.

Nogués, X.—La nostra gent. *Barcelona*: Imp. de López Ilausas, 1927. 59 pp. 1.50 pta. (Quaderns Blaus.)

Puga, A.—"Amalia Puga" (Las mejores poesías líricas de los mejores poetas). *Barcelona*: Cervantes, 1927. 77 pp. 1.50 pta.

Rullan, I.—Col·lecció poliglota de refranys. *Artá*: Ferrer Ginart, 1926. 30 pp. (Folklore balear. Vol. IV.)

Serra y Pagés, R.—Alguns escrits del professor Rossend Serra y Pagés. Coleccionats y publicats a honor del Mestre per les seves dexeables en ocasió del cinquantenari del seu professorat (1875-1925). *Barcelona*: Estampa de la Casa Miguel-Rius, 1926. xxxi + 244 pp.

GENERAL

Chotzen, T. M.—La poésie de Dafydd ab Gwilym, barde gallois du XIV^e s. Utrecht diss. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris, 1927. xii + 363 pp.

De Groot, A. W.—Instrumental phonetics. *Amsterdam*: 1928. 61 pp. (Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Deel 65, serie A. no. 2.)

Mustard, W. P.—Aeneas Silvii de curialium miseris epistola. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press. 102 pp. \$1.50.

Lombard, A.—La crise de l'histoire littéraire. *Neuchâtel*: Univ. de Neuchâtel, 1928. 22 pp.

Johns, E. J.—El Esperanto. Diss. *Havana*, 1928. 167 pp.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Brightfield, Myron F.—Theodore Hook and his Novels. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. x + 381. \$4.00.

Brinkley, Roberta Florence.—Nathan Field, the Actor-Playwright (Yale Studies in English LXXVII). Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. vi + 159. \$2.50.

Forster, Max.—Altenglisches Lesebuch für Anfänger, Dritte Auflage (Germanische Bibliothek). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928. Pp. x + 69. M. 2.

Garmonsway, G. N. (ed.).—An Early Norse Reader. Cambridge University Press, 1928. Pp. x + 148.

Halliday, Wilfrid J. (ed.).—Deloney's Gentle Craft, the First Part. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 90. \$0.50.

Hibler-Lebmansport, Leo.—Das mittenglische Versgedicht, The Seege of Troye, eine philologische Untersuchung nebst einem Abdruck der drei Handschriften. Graz: U. Mosers Buchhandlung, 1928. 2 Bde. xii + 212, iv + 64. M. 5.

Hotson, Leslie.—The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xvi + 424. \$5.00.

Koch, John (ed.).—Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen nebst Einleitung, Lesarten, Anmerkungen und einem Wörterverzeichnis (Englische Textbibliothek, J. Hoops, ed.). Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1928. Pp. viii + 260. M. 8.

Lamar, René (ed.).—Samuel Butler Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose (Cambridge English Classics). Cambridge University Press, 1928. Pp. xxi + 504.

Long, Mason.—A College Grammar. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1928. Pp. iv + 323. \$3.00.

Lüdeke, H.—Die Funktionen des Erzählers in Chaucers epischer Dichtung (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, Heft 72, L. Morsbach and H. Hecht, ed.). Haale/Saale: Max Niemeyer, 1927. Pp. x + 157. M. 8.

McKnight, George H., and Embley, Bert.—Modern English in the Making. New York: Appleton, 1928. Pp. xii + 500. \$4.00.

Parker, Roscoe E.—The Middle English Stanzaic Versions of the Life of Saint Anne. Oxford University Press for the Early English Text Society (Original Series 174), 1928. Pp. liv + 139. 10 s.

Pillsbury, Walter B., and Meader, Clarence L.—The Psychology of Language. New York: Appleton, 1928. Pp. vii + 306. \$3.00.

Reade, Aleyne Lyell.—Johnsonian Gleanings, Part V, The Doctor's Life, 1728-1735. Privately printed for the Author by Percy Lund, Humphries & Co., London: 1928. Pp. xii + 270.

Sedgefield, W. J.—An Anglo-Saxon Book of Verse and Prose. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928. Pp. x + 473. 12 s. 6 d. [Also published in two volumes.]

Slover, Clark Harris.—Early Literary Channels between Britain and Ireland (Reprinted from the University of Texas Studies in English, Nos. 6 and 7, 1926-1927). Pp. 1-52, 5-111.

Smith, David Nichol.—Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. vi + 91. \$2.00.

Smith, Reed.—South Carolina Ballads with a Study of the Traditional Ballads of To-day. Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. xii + 174. \$3.00.

Spiller, Robert E. (ed.).—Gleanings in Europe: France, by James Fenimore Cooper. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. xxxiv + 395. \$3.50.

Sutherland, J. R. (ed.).—Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 95. \$0.50. [A school edition with introduction, notes, and glossary of unfamiliar words.]

Thorndike, Ashley.—Shakespeare in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1927. Pp. 22. \$0.45.

GERMAN

Andreas-Salomé, Lou.—Rainer Maria Rilke. Mit 8 Lichtdrucktafeln. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1928. 125 pp. M. 6.

Benda, Oskar.—Der gegenwärtige Stand der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft. Eine erste Einführung in ihre Problemlage. [S.-A. aus Wissenschaft u. Schule]. Wien: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1928. 66 pp. M. 2.50.

Berndl, Raimund.—Muttersprache und Fremdwort. [Schriften des deutschen Schulvereins Südmärk]. Graz: Alpenland-Buchhandlung Südmärk [1928]. 20 pp. 40 Pf.

Cysarz, Herbert.—Schiller und unser 20. Jahrhundert. Vortrag. [Schriften der Freistudentenschaft Bern, H. 2.] Bern: A. Francke, 1928. 20 pp. Fr. 1.20.

Czapski-Erdmann, Veronika.—Die Auseinandersetzung des gotischen Weltgefühls mit dem antiken bei Rainer Maria Rilke. Jena: Frommann, 1927. 16 pp. 70 Pf.

Freydank, Hanns.—Goethe und Ramler. Halle: Ch. Graeger, 1928. 31 pp., 8 plates, 4°. M. 4.50.

Gottschalk, Rud.—Spitteler. Zurich: Rascher & Cie, 1928. 140 pp. M. 3.80.

Harn, Edith M.—Wieland's *Neuer Amadis* [Hesperia, Schriften zur germ. Phil. Nr 17.] Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928. 122 pp. \$1.50

Ipser, Gunther, and Karg, Fritz.—Schallanalytische Versuche Eine Einführung in die Schallanalyse [Germanische Bibliothek, 2. Abt. Untersuchungen u Texte, 24.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1928. xi, 319 pp., 8 leaves.

Jahn, Franz.—Wolfgang Menzel als politischer Charakter Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Burschenschafter in der Gesch. d. deu. Einigung. Berlin: K. Curtius, 1928. 58 pp. M. 2.

Kerner, Justinus.—Justinus Kerner und sein Münchener Freundeskreis. Eine Sammlung von Briefen. Hrsg. von Franz Pöckl (Enkel). Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1928. 400 pp., 8 plates. M. 9.

Korn, Adolf.—Tauler als Redner. [Forschungen und Funde, H. 21] Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1928. viii, 175 pp. M. 6.90.

Löschner, Hans.—Maximilian Klingers Romanzyklus in seiner philosophisch-pädagogischen Bedeutung. [Friedr. Mann's pädagog. Magazin, H. 1196.] Langensalea: H. Beyer & Söhne, 1928. 80 pp. M. 2.

Mitzka, Walther.—Sprachausgleich in den deutschen Mundarten bei Danzig. [Königsberger deutsche Forschungen H. 2.] Königsberg i. Pr.: Gräfe & Unzer, 1928. vii, 68 pp. M. 2.

Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch.—Jahrbuch des Vereins f. niederdeutsche Sprachforschung. Jg. 52, 1926. Norden: H. Soltau, 1928. iii, 128 pp. M. 4.

Orend, Misch.—Zur Heimatfrage der Siebenbürger Sachsen. Vergleichung der siebenbürgisch-deutschen Ortsnamen mit denen des übrigen deutschen Sprachgebietes. Hermine Klein, Die Bistritzer Mundart verglichen mit dem Sprachatlas des Deutschen Reichs. [Deutsche Dialektographie, H. 20.] Marburg: Elwert, 1927. vii, 312 pp., 8 plates. M. 15.

Pixberg, Herm.—Novalis als Naturphilosoph. Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928. 76 pp. M. 2.

Razinger, Hubert.—Carl Hauptmann. Gestalt und Werk. Krummhubel i. R.: Bonavoluntas-Verlag, 1928. xi, 211 pp. M. 5.

Stadelmann, Rud.—Der historische Sinn bei Herder. Halle: Niemeyer, 1928. iv, 151 pp. M. 7.

Tecchi, B.—Wackenroder. Firenze: Edizioni di Solania, A. Carocci, 1927. 219 pp. L. 9.

Walzel, Oskar.—Vom Wesen der Dichtung [Deutschkundliche Bucherei.] Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1928. 52 pp. 80 Pf.

FRENCH

Andrieux, L.—P. Gassendi. Diss. Paris: Lathure, 1927. 138 pp.

Babbitt, I.—Reading with a purpose. French Literature. Chicago: American Library Ass., 1928. 48 pp.

Badolle, M.—L'abbé Barthélemy et l'hellénisme en Fr. dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe s. Diss. Paris: Presses Univ., 1926. 414 pp.

Bossuat, R.—Drouart la Vache (1290). Diss. Paris: Champion, 1926. xx + 264 pp.

—Li Livres d'amours de Drouart la Vache. Diss. Ibid., 1926. viii + 275 pp.

Bourciez, J.—Le Parfait en Gascogne. Paris diss. Bordeaux: Gounouilhout, 1927. xvi + 251 pp.

Crawford, Mme B.—Noëls et noëlistes bourguignons. Diss. Dijon: Berthier, 1927. 187 pp.

Cretin, R.—Les images dans l'œuvre de Corneille. Diss. Caen: Olivier, 1927. xv + 397 pp.

—Lexique comp. des métaphores dans le théâtre de Corneille et de Racine. Diss. Ibid., 1927. xxix + 128 pp.

Damianov, H.—L'œuvre de Becque au théâtre. Diss. Grenoble: Imprimerie nouvelle, 1927. 242 pp.

Facteau, B. A.—Les romans de Richardson sur la scène fr. Diss. Paris: Presses univ., 1927. 144 pp.

Freund, C.—Des Vers Baudelaires. Munich: Grassinger, 1927. xiv + 73 pp.

Goodyear, N. A.—Delisle, Arlequin sauvage. New York: Century, 1928. xxvii + 121 pp. 95 cts.

Guiette, R.—La légende de la sacristine. Paris: Champion, 1927. 554 pp. Fr. 80. (Bib. de la R. L. C.)

Hart, C. R.—Chateaubriand and Homer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928. 168 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. Studies in Romance Lit. and Lang.)

Ivanoff, N.—La marquise de Sablé et son salon. Diss. Paris: Presses modernes, 1927. 229 pp.

Lallemand, P. de.—Montalembert et ses amis dans le Romantisme. Diss. Paris: Champion, 1927. 365 pp.

—Montalembert et ses relations litt. avec l'étranger. Diss. Ibid., 1927. 113 pp.

Langlard, H.—*La liaison dans le français*. Paris: Champion, 1928. 160 pp.

Levaillant, M.—V. Hugo, Tristesse d'Olympio, facsimilé et étude. Paris: Champion, 1928. 119 pp.

Malakis, E.—Intermediate Fr. functional grammar and comp. New York. Holt, 1928. xii + 240 pp.

McGee, S. L.—*La litt. américaine dans la Revue des deux mondes* Diss. Montpellier: La Charité, 1927. 214 pp.

Ragnal, M. A.—*Le talent de Mme de La Fayette*. Toulouse: diss. Paris: Picart. 252 pp.

—*La Nouvelle fr. de Segrais à Mme de La F.* Toulouse diss. Ibid. 123 pp.

Stauf, I.—*Recherches sur "ne" redondant*. Diss. Paris: Rousseau, 1927. 267 pp.

Thomas, A.—*Les conceptions sociales d'A. France*. Diss. Paris: Presses modernes, 1927. 107 pp.

Tillier, C.—*Mon Oncle Benjamin*, ed. A. H. Krappe. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1928. xxii + 206 pp.

Viatte, A.—*Les sources occultes du romantisme*. 2 vols Paris: Champion, 1928. 330 + 332 pp. (Bib. de la R. L. C.)

Vigneron, R.—*Explication de textes*. Chicago: U. of C. Press, 1928 25 pp 40 cts.

Welter, J.-Th.—*L'exemplum dans la litt. relig. et didac. du moyen âge*. Diss. Paris: Occitania, 1927. 562 pp.

—*Tabula exemplorum*. Diss. Ibid., 1926. lvi + 148 pp.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Filippo. Prefazione e note di C. Guerrieri Orcetti. Venezia: "La nuova Italia," 1928. 191 pp. L. 7. (Scrittori italiani.)

—*Satire ed epigrammi*; con introduzione e note di R. Guastalla. Milano: C. Signorelli, 1927. 125 pp. L. 4. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, no. 10.)

Balsamo-Crivelli, G.—*Le carte giobertiane della biblioteca civica di Torino*. Torino: Municipio, 1928. 263 pp. L. 10.

Bandello, Matteo.—*Le novelle*; a cura di G. Brognoligo. Vol. I. Seconda edizione riveduta. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1928. 423 pp. L. 30. (Scrittori d'Italia, no. 2.)

Bertacchi, G.—*Commemorazione di Emilio De Marchi*. Milano: Casa edit. "Amatrix," 1927. 55 pp.

Betteloni, V.—*Le più belle pagine, scelte da S. Benco*. Milano: Fratelli Treves, 1927. xv + 275 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani, scelte da scrittori viventi.)

Chiara, B.—*La gloria di Vittorio Alfieri*. Evocazioni e ricordi. Torino: E. Toffaloni, 1927. 249 pp. L. 8.

Felice da Massa.—*La fanciullezza di Gesù*. Poema inedito del secolo XIV, a cura di D. A. Perini Firenze: Libr. edit. fiorentina, 1927. 150 pp. L. 6. (Biblioteca agostiniana, vol. 3.)

Foresti, A.—*Aneddoti della vita di Francesco Petrarca*. Brescia: G. Vannini, 1928 xv + 478 pp. L. 30.

Foscolo, Ugo.—*Ultime lettere di Jacopo Ottis e i frammenti di un romanzo autobiografico*; con uno studio critico di N. Vaccalluzzo Catania: C. Galàtola, 1927. cxxxvii + 217 pp. L. 15. (Arte e letteratura, no. 3.)

Francesco, San.—*I Fioretti di — e il Cantico del sole* Con introduzione di G. Bertacchi. Nuova edizione notevolmente accresciuta, curata e munita di prefazione e di note da P. Pecchiai. Milano: Sonzogno, 1927. iv + 364 pp. L. 6.

Gentile, G.—*Vincenzo Cuoco*. Studi e appunti. Venezia: "La nuova Italia," 1927. xii + 185 pp. L. 16. (Educatori antichi e moderni.)

Lalli, G. B.—*La Moscheide e la Franceide*. Introduzione e note di G. Rua. Torino: Unione tip. edit. Torinese, 1927. xxviii + 268 pp. L. 10. (Classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 37.)

Maffei, Scipione.—*Opere drammatiche e poesie varie*; a cura di A. Avena. Bari: G. Laterza e figli, 1928 407 pp. L. 30. (Scrittori d'Italia, 104.)

Mannucci, L., e Bonifacio, G.—*Disegno storico-estetico della letteratura italiana, ad uso dei licei classici e scientifici*. Vol. I: *Le origini; il trecento; il quattrocento*. Livorno: R. Giusti, 1927. xi + 273 pp. L. 11.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—*Tutte le opere*. Con prefazione, indici, ritratti e autografi a cura di G. Lesca. Seconda edizione. Firenze: G. Barbera, 1928. xl + 1152 pp. L. 70. (Opera omnia dei grandi scrittori.)

Misericocchi, L.—*Ravenna e ravennati nel secolo XIX, memorie e notizie*, con prefazione di L. Rava. Ravenna: Soc. tip. edit. Ravennate e Mutilati, 1927. xiv + 378 pp. L. 11.

Monti, Vincenzo.—*Poesie scelte*; con introduzione e note di F. Carlesi. Sanca-sciano Pesa: Soc. edit. toscana, 1927. xx + 472 pp. L. 5. (Biblioteca classica popolare italiana e straniera, no. 20.)

Portigliotti, G.—*Donne del Rinascimento*. Milano: Fratelli Treves, 1927. 324 pp. L. 26.

Santangelo, S.—Le tenzoni poetiche nella letteratura italiana delle origini. *Genève*: L. S. Olschki, 1928. xi + 458 pp. Fr. 30. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum," serie I. storia, letteratura, paleografia, vol. 9.)

Vivaldi, V.—Calabresi illustri. F. Fiorentino, F. Tocco, V. Gallo-Areuri, D. Nilelli, P. Fuginele, A. Cefaly, A. Fazzari. *Calanzaro*: Tip. edit. Bruzia, 1927. 275 pp. L. 15.

SPANISH

Alvord, J. C.—Business Spanish. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. xxi + 315 pp. \$2.00.

Azorín.—Old Spain. Ed. with introduction, notes, exercises and vocabulary by G. B. Fundenburg. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. xix + 116 pp. \$0.80. (The Century Modern Language Series.)

Brown, S. W.—A Spanish Reader for beginners. *New York*: Knopf, 1928. xi + 167 pp. (The Borzoi Spanish Texts.)

— *Estudios gramáticos españoles.* *New York*: Knopf, 1927. xii + 211 pp. (The Borzoi Spanish Texts.)

Cano, J.—Cuentos humorísticos españoles. Ed. with notes, exercises and vocabulary by E. Goggio. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. vii + 146. (The Macmillan Hispanic Series.)

— *La vida de un pícaro.* Ed. with notes, exercises and vocabulary. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. xi + 153 pp. (Macmillan Hispanic Series.)

Castillo, C.—Lecturas introductorias. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Press, 1928. xi + 139. \$1.50

Castillo, C. and Watson, J. C.—Spanish Tales and Fables, with direct method exercises and annotations. *New York*: Holt and Co., 1928. 214 pp.

Crawford, J. P.—Los abencerrajes. Two old Spanish Stories adapted for intermediate classes. Ed. with notes, exercises and vocabulary. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. ix + 135 pp. (The Macmillan Hispanic Series.)

Delpy, G. et Viñas, A.—L'espagnol par les textes, 1^{re} et 2^{me} années. [Paris]: Hachette, [1927]. iii + 301 pp.

Grummon, S. E. and Noriega, A. de.—Tres meses en México. A Spanish Conversational Reader. *New York*: Scribner's Sons, 1928. xiii + 321 pp.

Hendrix, W. S.—Elementary Spanish. *Boston*: Heath, 1928. x + 173 pp. (Heath's Modern Language Series.)

Hendrix, W. S. and Porter, D. F.—Caballeros y escuderos. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Press, 1928. xi + 167. \$1.50.

Hills, E. C. and Ford, J. D. M.—A Spanish Grammar for Colleges. *Boston*: Heath and Co., 1928. vi + 330 pp. \$1.60. (Heath's Modern Language Series.)

Howard, J. P.—Spanish Syntax and Composition. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1927. 101 pp.

Jovellanos, G. M. de.—El deliniente honrado. Ed. with introduction, notes, exercises and vocabulary by H. Berkowitz and S. A. Wolfy. *New York*: The Century Co., 1927. xxvii + 116 pp. (The Century Modern Language Series.)

Laguardia, C. G. B. and Molt, P. M.—A Spanish Outline Grammar. *New York*: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1928. xii + 211 pp. \$1.20

Marquina, E.—Las flores de Atacón. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by S. E. Leavitt. *New York*: The Century Co., 1928. xxv + 222 pp. \$1.25. (The Century Modern Language Series.)

Parker, E. F. and Torres Rioseco, A.—An intermediate Spanish Grammar and Composition. *Boston*: Ginn and Co., 1928. viii + 302 pp. \$1.32.

Rodó, J. E.—Ariel. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by A. Nin Fías and J. D. Fitz-Gerald. *Chicago*: Sanborn & Co., 1928. xii + 180 pp. \$1.12. (The Hispanic Series.)

Rosenberg, S. L. M.—Libro de Lectura. Selección de M. Romero de Terreros. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary. *New York*: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. vii + 126 pp. \$1.00.

Rosenberg, S. L. M. and Templin, E. H.—A brief Anthology of Mexican prose. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary. *Stanford University, Cal.*: Stanford University Press, 1928. xxxv + 210 pp. (Stanford Spanish Series.)

Ruiz de Alarcón.—La prueba de las promesas. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by F. O. Reed and F. Eberling. *New York*: Knopf, 1928. xix + 155 pp. (The Borzoi Spanish Texts.)

Seymour, A. R. and Carnahan, D. H.—Alternate Spanish Review Grammar and Composition Book. *Boston*: Heath and Co., 1928. xii + 184 pp. \$1.28. (Heath's Modern Language Series.)

Torres, A.—Essentials of Spanish. *New York*: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1927. xiii + 414 pp.

Umphrey, G. W. and García Prada, C.—Selections from the prose and poetry of Rubén Darío. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary. *New York*: Macmillan, 1928. viii + 274. (The Macmillan Hispanic Series.)